# Fusion Centers CP #BlackLivesMatter

## 1NC

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should substantially curtail its fusion center domestic surveillance.

#### The Black Lives matter movement, centered around raising visibility around the issues of racialized violence, is gaining momentum against anti-blackness

Paschel 14 (Tianna, Assistant Professor of African American Studies, “The Making of a Grassroots Movement against Anti-black Racism” in Insurgency: The Black Matter(s) Issue Dept. of African American Studies | University of California, Berkeley http://www.thediasporablackmattersissue.com/ December 23, 2014

First, the recent waves of protest from Ferguson to Oakland to New York represent the emergence of a grassroots movement against anti-black racism, unprecedented in recent decades. Beyond the sheer size and number of protests, their locus has also been somewhat surprising given what we know about social movements. Rather than emerging from established civil rights organizations or black political elites that have long considered themselves the spokespersons of the black community, this movement has radiated out from the outraged and grieving families and communities of the black men killed by the police. In taking their struggle to the streets, these communities have targeted state institutions as well as ordinary Americans who have passively watched as black people experience racialized violence. What is most remarkable about the protests in Ferguson, in particular, is how collective pain and indignation itself has called so many people to the street, night after night, in the face of an increasingly militarized police force and largely outside of “respectable” black middle class institutions. Indeed, while in some cases, traditional civil rights institutions have helped to shine a spotlight on these injustices, their involvement has largely happened after mobilization was well underway. Moreover, amidst debates on the right as to whether these deaths were racially motivated at all, some traditional black leaders have tried to discipline protesters and emphasize personal responsibility as a potential remedy to the ills facing black communities. This was best captured in Al Sharpton’s eulogy at Mike Brown’s funeral, which spoke not only about racialized state violence, but the need for blacks to “clean up” their communities and embrace being successful. The family of Akai Gurley, another unarmed black man gunned down by the NYPD in a dark stairwell, refused to let Sharpton speak at his memorial service. In this sense, recent mobilization must be understood as having its roots in spontaneous, grassroots action that has become increasingly coordinated. The second root of such organizing both on the streets and on the internet *is* black youth-led social movement organizations and networks such as Black Lives Matter, We Charge Genocide and Black Youth Project 100 (BYP100), to name a few. All of them have emerged in recent years around the question of racialized police violence as well as other issues facing black people. In so doing, they have not only mobilized and raised visibility around these issues, but have also produced important written analyses of the situation. They have insisted that we understand these murders as systemic rather than episodic, as endemic rather than aberrations to an otherwise post-racial society and state apparatus. These organizations have also been emphatic about contextualizing these horrific events along a spectrum of state violence that black people, and particularly poor black people experience every day in the form of surveillance, hyper criminalization and mass incarceration.We Charge Genocide – a grassroots Chicago-based organization that emerged in the wake of the killing of Dominique “Damo” Franklin and that works to equip individuals and communities to “police” the police– took its name from a 1951 Petition with the same name. Originally submitted to the UN General Assembly submitted by the Civil Rights Congress, the petition documented 153 racial killings and was signed by W.E.B. Dubois and Paul Robeson, among many others. Its authors held that “the oppressed Negro citizens of the United States, segregated, discriminated against and long the target of violence, suffer from genocide as the result of the consistent, conscious, unified policies of every branch of government.” In a similar vein, the youth organizing with We Charge Genocide, along with the parents of Mike Brown made similar statements on state violence against black communities in front of the UN Committee on Torture in Geneva in November of this year. The parallels between these two moments of black resistance in both domestic and international space are many. These similarities caution us to resist the temptation to demarcate the current moment as constituting a new kind of racial violence.The third aspect of this movement that is important to underscore is that it is not a white movement. If you have participated in recent protests, or even seen footage of them, you have likely noticed that many of those organizing for racial justice and against anti-black racism are not black. In fact, a great deal of the images circulating in the newspapers in cities like New York and in the Bay Area show a great deal of white, likely middle class liberal whites marching and “dying in”. On the one hand, it is significant moment when whites chant “black lives matter”. This is especially the case when we consider that much of the racialized violence perpetuated against black people (though not all) has happened at the hands of white police officers who refuse to see black people as fully human. Having participated in some of the protests myself, I have to admit that watching black people being joined by other people of color and white people yell “black lives matter” gave me a little bit of renewed hope about the possibilities of breaking through the ideological force of “post-racial” America. On the other hand, the participation and visibility of white protestors has been highly problematic. Social Justice Blogger Tam highlighted this best in a recent post entitled “Dear White Protesters”: “As a Black person in this country, I am well aware that the streets belong to white people. I am not empowered or made more safe by hundreds of white people chanting that the streets belong to them. The street in Ferguson where Mike Brown was murdered and lay dead for 4.5 hours should have belonged to him, but it didn’t. He’s dead. He’s not coming back. That’s because the streets belong to white people.” Indeed, the impulse of many white protestors throughout the United States has not been to simply stand in solidarity with black communities and others affected directly by racialized state violence, but to appropriate that suffering, to “give voice” to black people, to be at the center of the movement.These tensions were accentuated in a recent protest organized by black students at the University of Chicago where students called on everyone to march, but only allowed black students to “die in”. This was a strategic decision that was an important one because it reaffirmed the fact that it is blackness itself that made Eric Garner and Mike Brown susceptible to what Achille Mbembe calls “necropolitics” or the “contemporary forms of subjugation of life to the power of death” that “profoundly reconfigure the relations among resistance, sacrifice, and terror”. Yet while it is important that black bodies remain at the center of this movement, it makes sense that we would not necessarily be there. Indeed, the same de-facto mandate of the police to serve and protect white people (and perhaps more importantly, white property) that led to the deaths of these black men is what makes whites so comfortable showing their outrage in public spaces, that affords them the privilege of feeling relatively safe while protesting, that prompts them to taunt police. As such, while broad-based cross-racial solidarity can certainly shape the sustainability and outcomes of this movement, there must also be a critical reflection among white protestors, as well as the movement more generally, about the ways in which whiteness is being articulated in it.Finally, it is important to note that while many protestors have made it clear that this is about black livesmattering, in much of the actual discourse and political practices, a concern for black men’s lives have eclipsed that of black people on the whole. This has led to a de-emphasis of the ways that racialized state violence affect black women. More importantly, the effective erasure of black girls and women from the popularized slogan “black lives matter” has also rendered invisible the stories of black women such as Tarika Wilson, Miriam Carey and Yvette Smith, all of whom were also brutally killed by the police. As a result, we have to ask ourselves why the stories of black men are the only ones that compel people to march, why their names are the only ones that are remembered. Ultimately, we are experiencing a special moment in black resistance. While the dynamics of mobilization that have coalesced under #blacklivesmatter are still somewhat nascent, they arguably started with mobilization around the deaths of Oscar Grant and Trayvon Martin years before. Of course, the racial violence to which they speak has an even longer and deeper history. What one senses as people have taken to the streets is a cumulative and collective sense of pain and outrage over the continual disrespect of black life and suffering. The haunting expression “I can’t breathe” that Eric Garner whispered while being choked to death by the NYPD has had deep resonance with black people as a metaphor to our suffering. It expresses a collective awareness that behind the brutal killing of Mike Brown are hundreds of other black women and men that black people have yet to be guaranteed the basic rights to life and dignity. The media has disparagingly called some of the mobilization around Ferguson as riots. While I do not share this analysis entirely, it makes sense that a people who feel like they can’t breathe might turn to riots, a strategy some scholars have aptly argued is the last weapon of the truly dispossessed.

## 2NC/1NR

### net benefit – institutions good

#### Rejecting and refusing to function with institutions and legal discourse impedes anti-oppression movements.

Crenshaw 88**,** Kimberle. Law @ UCLA, “RACE, REFORM, AND RETRENCHMENT: TRANSFORMATION AND LEGITIMATION IN ANTIDISCRIMINATION LAW”, 101 Harv. L. Rev. 1331, lexis // vs

The Critics' product is of limited utility to Blacks in its present form. The implications for Blacks of trashing liberal legal ideology are troubling, even though it may be proper to assail belief structures that obscure liberating possibilities. Trashing legal ideology seeks to tell us repeatedly what has already been established -- that legal discourse is unstable and relatively indeterminate. Furthermore, trashing offers no idea of how to avoid the negative consequences of engaging in reformist discourse or how to work around such consequences. Even if we imagine the wrong world when we think in terms of legal discourse, we must nevertheless exist in a present world where legal protection has at times been a blessing -- albeit a mixed one. The fundamental problem is that, although Critics criticize law because it functions to legitimate existing institutional arrangements, it is precisely this legitimating function that has made law receptive to certain demands in this area. The Critical emphasis on deconstruction as the vehicle for liberation leads to the conclusion that engaging in legal discourse should be avoided because it reinforces not only the discourse itself but also the society and the world that it embodies. Yet Critics offer little beyond this observation. Their focus is delegitimating rights rhetoric seems to suggest that, one rights rhetoric has been discarded, there exists a more productive strategy for change, one which does not reinforce existing patterns of domination. Unfortunately, no such strategy has yet been articulated, and it is difficult to imagine that racial minorities will ever be able to discover one. As Frances Fox Piven and Richard Cloward point out in an excellent account of the civil rights movement, popular struggles are a reflection of institutionally determined logic and a challenge to that logic. People can only demand change in ways that reflect the logic of the institutions that they are challenging. Demands for change do not reflect the institutional logic -- that is, demands that do not engage and subsequently reinforce the dominant ideology -- will probably be ineffective.

#### The affirmative fails to connect their advocacy to real political change – if the plan inherently cannot use the USFG, this dooms their kritik to nothing but another unrealistic theoretical approach.

**Lu 13**, Catherine. Associate Professor of Political Science, McGill University, July 2013, “Activist political theory and the challenge of global justice,” Ethics & Global Politics, Vol. 6, No. 2, [http://www.ethicsandglobalpolitics.net/index.php/egp/article/view/21627/28587 //](http://www.ethicsandglobalpolitics.net/index.php/egp/article/view/21627/28587%20//) vs

Which of these various international, state, corporate and civil society responses and proposals should we support? What political institutional changes are required to halt these repeated scenes of human wreckage produced by grave injustices such as the Rana Plaza building collapse? Is progress in breaking the vicious pattern of workplace catastrophes in the global apparel industry possible? What can political theorists contribute to these ongoing debates about global justice and responsibility? The main objective of Lea Ypi’s first book, *Global Justice and Avant-Garde Political Agency,* is precisely to provide an account of the role of political theory and political theorists in the struggles of contemporary political agents for global justice. For Ypi, the purpose of normative political theory in its ‘activist mode’ is to identify and assist contemporary ‘avant-garde political agents’ to realise progressive political change by formulating coherent and plausible normative views about the function and purpose of our social practices and institutions. This is accomplished by employing a historically informed and forward-looking dialectical method of learning from the trials, failures, and successes of past political struggles with a view to evaluating the adequacy of different interpretations of the function and purposes of social institutions and practices, and distinguishing between more regressive or status quo, and more progressive interpretations of the relevant normative principles.[20](http://www.ethicsandglobalpolitics.net/index.php/egp/article/view/21627/28587#NOTE0020_21627) The criteria for adjudicating between different normative interpretations of the function and purpose of political institutions involve meeting three tasks. First, an interpretation (or family of interpretations) is better than its rivals if it is able to diagnose the causes of persistent and profound patterns of social conflict at an appropriate level of analysis, accounting for the empirical evidence better than its competitors. Second, an interpretation is superior if it is able, after identifying inadequacies in old normative categories, to innovate from them and ‘formulate principles that preserve all the normative benefits of its predecessors whilst avoiding their failures’. Third, a normative interpretation can outperform its rivals if it displays ‘heuristic potential,’ providing new ways to conceive of the purposes or functions of social institutions and practices, in light of theoretical innovations that anticipate new, unforeseen questions and challenges. A dialectical approach thus helps to make progress under contemporary conditions possible by providing a way to judge which theories (or families of theories) spawned by social and political conflicts and crises are ‘better able to combine principles and agency in a fundamentally appropriate but also politically effective and motivationally sustainable way’. In light of the novel political and moral challenges wrought by new agents and circumstances of politics, normative political theory should aim to revise or refine interpretations of the normative principles underlying our social practices and institutions, in ways that improve their functionality and responsiveness to the concerns and commitments of the agents subjected to them.[21](http://www.ethicsandglobalpolitics.net/index.php/egp/article/view/21627/28587#NOTE0021_21627) The normative theorist who is engaged in this activist mode works in tandem with the ‘avant-garde political agents’ who struggle for progressive political transformations: both are likened to ‘creative scientists or artists who put existing knowledge and techniques at the service of fresh experiments, developing new perspectives, asking unprecedented questions, and paving the way for the development of alternative paradigms’.[22](http://www.ethicsandglobalpolitics.net/index.php/egp/article/view/21627/28587#NOTE0022_21627) Drawing on the history of the women’s movement, the anti-slavery movement, workers’ movements, anti-colonial movements, and human rights movements, Ypi observes that the most effectual avant-garde political agents were those who tried ‘to subvert specific interpretive patterns from within, while continuing to act as their critical voice’.[23](http://www.ethicsandglobalpolitics.net/index.php/egp/article/view/21627/28587#NOTE0023_21627) In terms of theories of global justice, Ypi finds Kant’s own political theory exemplary for combining a cosmopolitan account of normative principles with a statist conception of political agency, and she interprets Kant’s ‘moral politician’ to be similar to a cosmopolitan avant-garde political agent who makes it her ‘duty to act within the state in conformity with cosmopolitan principles of justice’.[24](http://www.ethicsandglobalpolitics.net/index.php/egp/article/view/21627/28587#NOTE0024_21627) An adequate activist political theory should be able to give an account of the moral desirability of principles, as well their political feasibility and motivational sustainability. Doing so requires confronting issues of principle and issues of political agency, and combining them in ways that make possible progressive political change. Ypi observes, however, that normative political theorists have tended to ignore the normative relevance of political agency to the task of formulating normative principles for politics. This ignorance or disconnect between normative principles and political agency is apparent in the two dominant approaches—ideal and non-ideal—to normative political theory. Ideal theory approaches are truth-seeking enterprises that ‘try to identify and establish a fundamentally appropriate analysis of first-order normative principles, regardless of whether these principles can meaningfully guide action in the real world’.[25](http://www.ethicsandglobalpolitics.net/index.php/egp/article/view/21627/28587#NOTE0025_21627) While constructing principles based on idealised agents, structures, and conditions may have some critical force in that they provide a basis for evaluating the justness of existing principles, practices, and social conditions, Ypi argues that ideal theoretical approaches tend to generate principles that are indeterminate, irrelevant, or distorting, given their disconnection from issues of political agency.[26](http://www.ethicsandglobalpolitics.net/index.php/egp/article/view/21627/28587#NOTE0026_21627)Non-ideal approaches, in contrast, ‘aim to develop principles able to guide agency in empirically contingent circumstances’, and typically take the current circumstances conditioning social and political agency to ‘play a constitutive role’ in formulating the relevant normative principles.[27](http://www.ethicsandglobalpolitics.net/index.php/egp/article/view/21627/28587#NOTE0027_21627) Ypi is concerned, however, that non-ideal theoretical approaches are vulnerable to a status quo bias, compromising the critical task of normative theory by taking too much of existing agents, practices, institutions, and conditions as they are. Ypi admits that these are stylised reconstructions, and that most contemporary political theories of global justice exhibit elements of both ideal and non-ideal theoretical approaches so understood. Indeed, it should be noted that Ypi’s interpretation of the function of ideal and non-ideal theories reveals a certain dissatisfaction with a standard way of thinking about their distinction.[28](http://www.ethicsandglobalpolitics.net/index.php/egp/article/view/21627/28587#NOTE0028_21627) In the seminal account by John Rawls, ideal theories are the primary task of the political theorist, and have as their aim the identification of the correct first-order normative principles to guide the major social and political institutions of a society. Ideal theory accomplishes this task by abstracting from historically contingent circumstances, and idealising agents, structures or conditions in certain counterfactual and favourable ways.[29](http://www.ethicsandglobalpolitics.net/index.php/egp/article/view/21627/28587#NOTE0029_21627) Non-ideal theory is distinguished by its aim to identify transitional normative principles in response to unfavourable contexts where agents are either wilfully acting against the normative principles identified in ideal theory, or are involuntarily incapable of acting according to those principles. For example, in Rawls’s *Law of Peoples*, the duty of assistance is a principle of non-ideal theory to deal with the problematic existence of burdened societies that lack the capacity to develop domestically decent or just political and social institutions.[30](http://www.ethicsandglobalpolitics.net/index.php/egp/article/view/21627/28587#NOTE0030_21627) Non-ideal principles thus serve a transitional aim of helping agents to progress towards an ideal account of justice. Ypi’s formulation of the distinction between ideal and non-ideal approaches to political theory serves a different purpose than this Rawlsian account. Her interpretation of the distinction operates to highlight the relationship between normative principles and political agency, and how problematic relationships between these–too distant and too close–can undermine either the critical value or the efficacy of any normative theory. From an activist theoretical perspective, ideal theoretical approaches may avoid a status quo bias, but they typically fail to contribute to solving problems confronted by agents currently suffering from inadequate political and social institutions and arrangements, whereas non-ideal theoretical approaches tend to generate myopic views of problem solving that typically lack critical force or emanicipatory potential. With her account of ‘activist political theory’ and the ‘dialectical approach’, Ypi is able to expose unconstructive aspects of the contemporary global justice debate among the two main rivals, cosmopolitans and statists. Ypi is not against cosmopolitanism, but she criticises a tendency of cosmopolitan theorists to dismiss the normative relevance of the state and state-based associations for realising cosmopolitan egalitarian conceptions of global justice. This dismissal, most salient in cosmopolitan arguments about the moral arbitrariness and insignificance of political associations or relational ties, is unconstructive and detrimental to the cause of advancing cosmopolitan normative principles because it fails to recognise the importance of political agency for the realisation of cosmopolitan aims. According to Ypi, the cosmopolitan disavowal of political membership and associative relations ‘is both unnecessary and unwarranted … Rejecting the normative standing of political communities hardly supports the defense of global distributive principles; it merely draws attention away from some relevant conceptual tools necessary to analyse global political transformation’. Being disconnected from how political agency takes shape in the world, and failing to provide principled guidance on how agents committed to cosmopolitan normative principles should aim to reform particular institutions and practices, deprives cosmopolitan theories of their transformative potential and relevance to contemporary political struggles for global justice.[31](http://www.ethicsandglobalpolitics.net/index.php/egp/article/view/21627/28587#NOTE0031_21627) A critical and constructive theory of global justice should not only provide normative principles that are fundamentally appropriate, but also address issues of political agency that render such principles politically effective and motivationally sustainable.