

## Twitter Thread by [emmi](#)



[emmi](#)

[@emmibevensee](#)



**The "polarization is the problem" narrative to me is bad because it implies the status quo was a stable and acceptable set of trade-offs. It's the equivalent of a pollyanna "why can't we all get along" but the we in question is white supremacy and its targets.**

like i understand that conflict mediation requires mutual concessions (i did my MA in conflict studies) and while it's important to meet people's deep needs across spectrums of difference, certain things are just not up for negotiation.

Also while peacebuilding work is good. It's not just "seeing each other as human" it's literally about transforming structural issues. (hence Galtung's distinction between positive and negative peace wherein negative peace is like a ceasefire and positive is a transformed society.

And I think that to whatever extent that kind of peacebuilding work is applicable, it's not between fascists and people who think fascists are bad. Fascists are not invited. They are only invited if they seize territories and can't be crushed. Then secret negotiations.

The US is always like "we don't negotiate with terrorists" but literally every president negotiates with who they consider to be terrorists. It's all just down low. But that's just because counter-insurgency failed.

So even from the conservative imperial perspective of the US gov you don't have to normalize terror cells as 'equal participants in an inequality of needs'. And i obv think our perspective should be uhhhh, a lot more advanced than that of US military.

So maybe this means i'm digging my heels into bunkers and supporting polarization but, there are a lot of possible paths and most of them suck, but none of them should involve the normalization of actual fascism as distinct from like meeting the needs of rural USians etc.

Also to state the obvious, the contradictions of the status-quo were only considered quiet before to those who didn't have a boot on their neck. Everyone else already knew it wasn't stable and led to whatever ""polarization"" currently exists.

But when you look at it like that the idea comes a little more clear. 'Polarization' in this case is often running cover for the normalization of reaction against basic calls for removing the boot from ones face.

Oh and you may also be interested in a kind of dark but useful concept in peacebuilding called "ripeness theory" which basically states if either side has any hope for winning the cycle of violence will continue. Mediation only works when a conflict is "ripe" -very deep into loss

Maybe I'm beating around the bush. In short, I think antifascism is good and fascism is bad. Maybe that makes me part of the problem / a wrecker / unenlightened. \*shrug\* I don't care.

Galtung (who I always forget is on twitter) added to my thread that Ripeness theory is too cynical which I think is fair.