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## 1NC

### 1

#### A. Our interpretation is that the affirmative should have to instrumentally defend the institutional implementation of a topical plan.

#### B. Violation – the aff doesn’t defend a plan.

#### C. Best for fairness.

#### 1. Plan focus is the only predictable way of affirming the resolution. Philosophical and theoretical concerns certainly play into the ways that policies are made, but the resolution only calls for us to defend and/or question political-institutional implementations of these kinds of concerns.

#### 2. Plan focus is the only way to ensure a fair division of ground. The affirmative has the advantage of trying to solve the most heinous problems of the status quo—without plan focus, debates devolve into whether or not things like racism, sexism, classism, or homophobia are good or bad. While problems are often less contestable, solutions to these problems are—we can debate about whether or not a particular proposal will fix or worsen these problems and proffer our own solutions.

#### D. Best for education:

#### No solvency for their critique without institutional focus. We must try to change policy in order to change the world—the concentration of power in the hands of political elites is inevitable, so we must work within that system to check oppression and violence.

Themba-Nixon 2k [Makani, Executive Director of the Praxis Project, *Colorlines* 3.2, pg. 12]

The flourish and passion with which she made the distinction said everything. Policy is for wonks, sell-out politicians, and ivory-tower eggheads. Organizing is what real, grassroots people do. Common as it may be, this distinction doesn't bear out in the real world. Policy is more than law. It is any written agreement (formal or informal) that specifies how an institution, governing body, or community will address shared problems or attain shared goals. It spells out the terms and the consequences of these agreements and is the codification of the body's values-as represented by those present in the policymaking process. Given who's usually present, most policies reflect the political agenda of powerful elites. Yet, policy can be a force for change-especially when we bring our base and community organizing into the process. In essence, policies are the codification of power relationships and resource allocation. Policies are the rules of the world we live in. Changing the world means changing the rules. So, if organizing is about changing the rules and building power, how can organizing be separated from policies? Can we really speak truth to power, fight the right, stop corporate abuses, or win racial justice without contesting the rules and the rulers, the policies and the policymakers? The answer is no-and double no for people of color. Today, racism subtly dominates nearly every aspect of policymaking. From ballot propositions to city funding priorities, policy is increasingly about the control, de-funding, and disfranchisement of communities of color. What Do We Stand For? Take the public conversation about welfare reform, for example. Most of us know it isn't really about putting people to work. The right's message was framed around racial stereotypes of lazy, cheating "welfare queens" whose poverty was "cultural." But the new welfare policy was about moving billions of dollars in individual cash payments and direct services from welfare recipients to other, more powerful, social actors. Many of us were too busy to tune into the welfare policy drama in Washington, only to find it washed up right on our doorsteps. Our members are suffering from workfare policies, new regulations, and cutoffs. Families who were barely getting by under the old rules are being pushed over the edge by the new policies. Policy doesn't get more relevant than this. And so we got involved in policy-as defense. Yet we have to do more than block their punches. We have to start the fight with initiatives of our own. Those who do are finding offense a bit more fun than defense alone. Living wage ordinances, youth development initiatives, even gun control and alcohol and tobacco policies are finding their way onto the public agenda, thanks to focused community organizing that leverages power for community-driven initiatives. - Over 600 local policies have been passed to regulate the tobacco industry. Local coalitions have taken the lead by writing ordinances that address local problems and organizing broad support for them. - Nearly 100 gun control and violence prevention policies have been enacted since 1991. - Milwaukee, Boston, and Oakland are among the cities that have passed living wage ordinances: local laws that guarantee higher than minimum wages for workers, usually set as the minimum needed to keep a family of four above poverty. These are just a few of the examples that demonstrate how organizing for local policy advocacy has made inroads in areas where positive national policy had been stalled by conservatives. Increasingly, the local policy arena is where the action is and where activists are finding success. Of course, corporate interests-which are usually the target of these policies-are gearing up in defense. Tactics include front groups, economic pressure, stand for takes place in the shaping of demands. By getting into the policy arena in a proactive manner, we can take our demands to the next level. Our demands can become law, with real consequences if the agreement is broken. After all the organizing, press work, and effort, a group should leave a decisionmaker with more than a handshake and his or her word. Of course, this work requires a certain amount of interaction with "the suits," as well as struggles with the bureaucracy, the technical language, and the all-too-common resistance by decisionmakers. Still, if it's worth demanding, it's worth having in writing-whether as law, regulation, or internal policy. From ballot initiatives on rent control to laws requiring worker protections, organizers are leveraging their power into written policies that are making a real difference in their communities. Of course, policy work is just one tool in our organizing arsenal, but it is a tool we simply can't afford to ignore. Making policy work an integral part of organizing will require a certain amount of retrofitting. We will need to develop the capacity to translate our information, data, and experience into stories that are designed to affect the public conversation. Perhaps most important, we will need to move beyond fighting problems and on to framing solutions that bring us closer to our vision of how things should be. And then we must be committed to making it so.

### 2

#### The aff only describes one facet of race but claims that it is a universal approach – this renders anyone outside of Black/White invisible

Perea 97 [Professor of Law, University of Florida College of Law, Juan, RACE, ETHNICITY & NATIONHOOD: ARTICLE: The Black/White Binary Paradigm of Race: The "Normal Science" of American Racial Thought, California Law Review, October, 1997, 85 Calif. L. Rev. 1213, p. 1254]

My objection to the state of most current scholarship on race is simply that **most of this scholarship** claims universality of treatment while actually describing only part of its subject**, the relationship between Blacks and Whites**. **Race in the United States means more than just Black and White**. **It also refers to Latino/a, Asian, Native American, and other racialized groups. Accordingly, books** titled "Race in America" or "White Racism" **that only discuss Blackness and Whiteness claim a universality of scope that they do not deliver**. **These books offer a** paradigmatic rendering of their subject that excludes **important portions of civil rights history. Authors of such books need to be aware that they promulgate a binary paradigm of race that operates to** silence and render invisible **Latinos/as, Asian Americans and Native Americans. Accordingly,** they reproduce a serious harm.

#### Turns the aff – we can never solve white racism

Perea 10 [Cone, Wagner, Nugent, Johnson, Hazouri & Roth Professor of Law, University of Florida Levin College of Law, Juan, AN ESSAY ON THE ICONIC STATUS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT AND ITS UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES, Virginia Journal of Social Policy & the Law, Vol. 18:1, Fall, p. 57-58, http://scs.student.virginia.edu/vjspl/18.2/Perea.pdf]

Lastly, **recognizing a fuller scope of civil rights struggles is important in helping us understand the full measure of unremedied past injustice. If we take no account of denials of civil rights to Mexican Americans, American Indians, and Native Hawaiians, among other groups, then we** underestimate dramatically **the scope of white racism**. **Every struggle against racism and oppression deserves recognition**. The iconic status of the African-American Civil Rights Movement is a testament to the power of righteous struggle. While it certainly deserves its hallowed place in our history and our hearts, we should be careful that its long shadow not obscure the importance of other righteous struggles. **If we care about justice, we should always be attuned to struggles for greater justice**, whether or not they resemble the African-American struggle for civil rights. **As inspiring as the African-American struggle has been, we may find additional inspiration, and more possibilities for justice, if we cast our gaze beyond** the African-American Civil Rights Movement, gazing further back, further forward, and to the side.

#### Thus the alternative: reject the aff’s Black/White binary of race.

#### This is crucial to build democratic alliances that challenge all oppression.

West 93 [ultimate badass, Cornel, Race Matters, p. 103-104]

**If we are to build on the best of Malcolm X, we must preserve and expand his notion of psychic conversion that cements networks and groups in which black community, humanity, love, care, and concern can take root and grow** (the work of bell hooks is the best example). **These spaces** -- beyond the best of black music and black religion -- reject Manichean ideologies **and authoritarian arrangements in the name of moral visions, subtle analyses of wealth and power, and concrete strategies of principled coalitions and** democratic alliances. **These visions, analyses, and strategies never lose sight of black rage, yet they focus this rage where it belongs:** on any form **of racism, sexism, homophobia, or economic injustice that impedes the opportunities of "everyday people**" (to use the memorable phrase of Sly and the Family Stone and Arrested Development) **to live lives of dignity and decency**. For example, poverty can be as much a target of rage as degraded identity. Furthermore, **the cultural hybrid character of black life leads us to highlight** a metaphor alien to Malcolm X's perspective -- yet consonant with his performances to audiences -- namely, the metaphor of jazz. I use the term "jazz" here not so much as a term for a musical art form, as for **a mode of being in the world**, **an improvisational mode of protean, fluid, and flexible dispositions toward reality suspicious of "either/or" viewpoints, dogmatic pronouncements, or supremacist ideologies**. To be a jazz freedom fighter is to attempt to galvanize and energize world-weary people into forms of organization with accountable leadership that promote critical exchange and broad reflection. The interplay of individuality and unity is not one of uniformity and unanimity imposed from above but rather of conflict among diverse groupings that reach a dynamic consensus subject to questioning and criticism. As with a soloist in a jazz quartet, quintet or band, individuality is promoted in order to sustain and increase the creative tension with the group -- a tension that yields higher levels of performance to achieve the aim of the collective project. **This kind of** critical anddemocratic sensibility **flies in the face of any policing of borders and boundaries of "blackness," "maleness," "femaleness," or "whiteness." Black people's rage ought to target white supremacy, but also ought to realize that blackness per se can encompass feminists like** Frederick **Douglass or** W. E. B. Du **Bois. Black people's rage should not overlook homophobia, yet also should acknowledge that heterosexuality per se can be associated with so-called "straight" anti-homophobes** -- **just as the struggle against black poverty can be supported by progressive elements of any race, gender, or sexual orientation**. **Malcolm X was the first great black spokesperson who looked ferocious white racism in the eye, didn't blink, and lived long enough to tell America the truth about this glaring hypocrisy in a bold and defiant manner**. Unlike Elijah Muhammad and Martin Luther King, Jr., he did not live long enough to forge his own distinctive ideas and ways of channeling black rage in constructive channels to change American society. **Only if we are as willing as Malcolm X to grow and confront the new challenges posed by the black rage of our day will we take the black freedom struggle to a new and higher level. The future of this country may well depend on it**.

### 3

#### 1. The affirmative commodifies an essentialized notion of race to frame inequality, replicating racism and shattering class-based coalitions, ensuring the capitalist social relations that build the ghettoes and favells that imprison racialized populations become inevitable, turning the case

Darder and Torres 99 (Antonia Darder, Professor of Educational Policy Studies and Latino/a Studies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and Rodolpho D. Torres, Professor of Planning, Policy & Design and Political Science at UC Irvine, “Shattering the ‘Race’ Lens: Toward a Critical Theory of Racism”, Chapter 7 of the book “Critical Ethnicity: Countering the Waves of Identity Politics”, edited by Robert H. Tai and Mary L. Kenyatta, p. 174-176)

Over the last three decades, there has been an overwhelming tendency among social science scholars to focus on notions of “race.” Over the last three decades, there has been an overwhelming tendency among a variety of critical scholars to focus on the concept of "race" as a central category of analysis for interpreting the social conditions of inequality and marginalization.’ As a consequence, much of the literature on subordinate cultural populations, with its emphasis on such issues as "racial inequality," "racial segregation," "racial identity," has utilized the construct of "race" as a central category of analysis for interpreting the social conditions of inequality and marginalization. ln turn, this literature has reinforced a racialized politics of identity and representation, with its problematic emphasis on "racial" identity as the overwhelming impulse for political action. This theoretical practice has led to serious analytical weaknesses and absence of depth in much of the historical and contemporary writings on racialized populations in this country. The politics of busing in the early 1970s provides an excellent example that illustrates this phenomenon. Social scientists studying "race relations" concluded that contact among "Black" and "White" students would improve "race relations" and the educational conditions of "Black" students if they were bused to "White" (better) schools outside their neighborhoods!” Thirty years later, many parents and educators adamantly denounce the busing solution (a solution based on a discourse of ”race") as not only fundamentally problematic to the fabric of African American and Chicano communities, but an erroneous social policy experiment that failed to substantially improve the overall academic performance of students in these communities. Given this legacy, it is not surprising to find that the theories, practices, and policies that have informed social science analysis of racialized populations today are overwhelmingly rooted in a politics of identity, an approach that is founded on parochial notions of "race" and representation which ignore the imperatives of capitalist accumulation and the existence of class divisions within racialized subordinate populations. The folly of this position is critiqued by Ellen Meiksins Wood in her article entitled "Identity Crisis," where she exposes the limitations of a politics of identity which fails to contend with the fact that capitalism is the most totalizing system of social relations the world has ever known. Yet, in much of the work on African American, Latino, Native American, and Asian populations, an analysis of class and a critique of capitalism is conspicuously absent. And even when it is mentioned, the emphasis is primarily on an undifferentiated plurality of identity politics or an “intersection of oppressions," which, unfortunately, ignores the overwhelming tendency of capitalism to homogenize rather than to diversify human experience. Moreover, this practice is particularly disturbing since no matter where one travels around the world, there is no question that racism is integral to the process of capital accumulation. For example, the current socioeconomic conditions of Latinos and other racialized populations can be traced to the reletless emergence of the global economy and recent economic policies of expansion, such as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). A recent United Nations report by the International Labor Organization conﬁrms the negative impact of globalization on racialized populations. By the end of 1998, it was projected that one billion workers would be unemployed. The people of Africa, China, and Latin America have been most affected by the current restructuring of capitalist development.“ This phenomenon of racialized capitalism is directly linked to the abusive practices and destructive impact of the “global factory’ '—a global ﬁnancial enterprise system that includes such transnational corporations as Coca Cola, Walmart, Disney, Ford Motor Company, and General Motors. In a recent speech on "global economic apartheid," John Cavanagh," co-executive director of the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, D.C., comments on the practices of the Ford Motor Company. The Ford Motor Company has its state-of-the-art assembly plant in Mexico . . . where because it can deny basic worker rights, it can pay one-tenth the wages and yet get the same quality and the same productivity in producing goods. . . .The same technologies by the way which are easing globalization are also primarily cutting more jobs than they're creating. The failure of scholars to confront this dimension in their analysis of contemporary society as a racialized phenomenon and their tendency to continue treating class as merely one of a multiplicity of (equally valid) perspectives, which may or may not "intersect" with the process of racialization, are serious shortcomings. In addressing this issue, we must recognize that identity politics, which generally gloss over class differences and/ or ignore class contradictions, have often been used by radical scholars and activists within African American, Latino, and other subordinate cultural communities in an effort to build a political base. Here, fabricated constructions of "race" are objectified and mediated as truth to ignite political support, divorced from the realities of class struggle. By so doing, they have unwittingly perpetuated the vacuous and dangerous notion that the political and economic are separate spheres of society which can function independently—a view that ﬁrmly anchors and sustains prevailing class relations of power in society.

#### 2. The logic of capitalism results in extinction through the creation of ecological catastrophe and violent imperialist wars that will turn nuclear

Foster 5 [John Bellamy, Monthly Review, September, Vol. 57, Issue 4, “Naked Imperialism”, <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0905jbf.htm>]

From the longer view offered by a historical-materialist critique of capitalism, the direction that would be taken by U.S. imperialism following the fall of the Soviet Union was never in doubt. Capitalism by its very logic is a globally expansive system. The contradiction between its transnational economic aspirations and the fact that politically it remains rooted in particular nation states is insurmountable for the system. Yet, ill-fated attempts by individual states to overcome this contradiction are just as much a part of its fundamental logic. In present world circumstances, when one capitalist state has a virtual monopoly of the means of destruction, the temptation for that state to attempt to seize full-spectrum dominance and to transform itself into the de facto global state governing the world economy is irresistible. As the noted Marxian philosopher István Mészáros observed in Socialism or Barbarism? (2001)—written, significantly, before George W. Bush became president: “[W]hat is at stake today is not the control of a particular part of the planet—no matter how large—putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower, with all means—even the most extreme authoritarian and, if needed, violent military ones—at its disposal.” The unprecedented dangers of this new global disorder are revealed in the twin cataclysms to which the world is heading at present: nuclear proliferation and hence increased chances of the outbreak of nuclear war, and planetary ecological destruction. These are symbolized by the Bush administration’s refusal to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to limit nuclear weapons development and by its failure to sign the Kyoto Protocol as a first step in controlling global warming. As former U.S. Secretary of Defense (in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations) Robert McNamara stated in an article entitled “Apocalypse Soon” in the May–June 2005 issue of Foreign Policy: “The United States has never endorsed the policy of ‘no first use,’ not during my seven years as secretary or since. We have been and remain prepared to initiate the use of nuclear weapons—by the decision of one person, the president—against either a nuclear or nonnuclear enemy whenever we believe it is in our interest to do so.” The nation with the greatest conventional military force and the willingness to use it unilaterally to enlarge its global power is also the nation with the greatest nuclear force and the readiness to use it whenever it sees fit—setting the whole world on edge. The nation that contributes more to carbon dioxide emissions leading to global warming than any other (representing approximately a quarter of the world’s total) has become the greatest obstacle to addressing global warming and the world’s growing environmental problems—raising the possibility of the collapse of civilization itself if present trends continue. The United States is seeking to exercise sovereign authority over the planet during a time of widening global crisis: economic stagnation, increasing polarization between the global rich and the global poor, weakening U.S. economic hegemony, growing nuclear threats, and deepening ecological decline. The result is a heightening of international instability. Other potential forces are emerging in the world, such as the European Community and China,that could eventually challenge U.S. power, regionally and even globally. Third world revolutions, far from ceasing, are beginning to gain momentum again, symbolized by Venezuela’s Bolivarian Revolution under Hugo Chávez. U.S. attempts to tighten its imperial grip on the Middle East and its oil have had to cope with a fierce, seemingly unstoppable, Iraqi resistance, generating conditions of imperial overstretch. With the United States brandishing its nuclear arsenal and refusing to support international agreements on the control of such weapons, nuclear proliferation is continuing. New nations, such as North Korea, are entering or can be expected soon to enter the “nuclear club.” Terrorist blowback from imperialist wars in the third world is now a well-recognized reality, generating rising fear of further terrorist attacks in New York, London, and elsewhere. Such vast and overlapping historical contradictions, rooted in the combined and uneven development of the global capitalist economy along with the U.S. drive for planetary domination, foreshadow what is potentially the most dangerous period in the history of imperialism. The course on which U.S and world capitalism is now headed points to global barbarism—or worse. Yet it is important to remember that nothing in the development of human history is inevitable. There still remains an alternative path—the global struggle for a humane, egalitarian, democratic, and sustainable society. The classic name for such a society is “socialism.” Such a renewed struggle for a world of substantive human equality must begin by addressing the system’s weakest link and at the same time the world’s most pressing needs—by organizing a global resistance movement against the new naked imperialism.

#### 3. The history of slavery proves that race is merely a symptom of capital—any discussion of racism must first start at the violent history of capital accumulation.

Keefer 3 (Tom, member of Facing Reality, New Socialist Magazine, January 2003, “Constructs of Capitalism: Slavery and the Development of Racism”,

<http://www.newsocialist.org/magazine/39/article03.html>, RSR)

The brutality and viciousness of capitalism is well known to the oppressed and exploited of this world. Billions of people throughout the world spend their lives incessantly toiling to enrich the already wealthy, while throughout history any serious attempts to build alternatives to capitalism have been met with bombings, invasions, and blockades by imperialist nation states. Although the modern day ideologues of the mass media and of institutions such as the World Bank and IMF never cease to inveigh against scattered acts of violence perpetrated against their system, they always neglect to mention that the capitalist system they lord over was called into existence and has only been able to maintain itself by the sustained application of systematic violence. It should come as no surprise that this capitalist system, which we can only hope is now reaching the era of its final demise, was just as rapacious and vicious in its youth as it is now. The "rosy dawn" of capitalist production was inaugurated by the process of slavery and genocide in the western hemisphere, and this "primitive accumulation of capital" resulted in the largest systematic murder of human beings ever seen. However, the rulers of society have found that naked force is often most economically used in conjunction with ideologies of domination and control which provide a legitimizing explanation for the oppressive nature of society. Racism is such a construct and it came into being as a social relation which condoned and secured the initial genocidal processes of capitalist accumulation--the founding stones of contemporary bourgeois society. While it is widely accepted that the embryonic capitalist class came to power in the great bourgeois revolutions of the 17th and 18th centuries, what is comparatively less well known is the crucial role that chattel slavery and the plunder of the "New World" played in calling this class into being and providing the "primitive accumulation of capital" necessary to launch and sustain industrialization in Europe. The accidental "discovery" of the Western Hemisphere by the mass murderer Christopher Columbus in 1492 changed everything for the rival economic and political interests of the European states. The looting and pillaging of the "New World" destabilized the European social order, as Spain raised huge armies and built armadas with the unending streams of gold and silver coming from the "New World", the spending of which devalued the currency reserves of its rivals. The only way Portugal, England, Holland, and France could stay ahead in the regional power games of Europe was to embark on their own colonial ventures. In addition to the extraction of precious minerals and the looting and pillaging of indigenous societies, European merchant-adventurers realized that substantial profits could also be made through the production of cash crops on the fertile lands surrounding the Caribbean sea. The only problem was that as the indigenous population either fled from enslavement or perished from the diseases and deprivations of the Europeans, there was no one left to raise the sugar, tobacco, cotton, indigo, and other tropical cash crops that were so profitable. A system of waged labour would not work for the simple reason that with plentiful land and easy means of subsistence surrounding them, colonists would naturally prefer small scale homesteading instead of labouring for their masters. As the planter Emanuel Downing of Massachusetts put it in 1645: "I do not see how we can thrive until we get a stock of slaves sufficient to do all our business, for our children's children will hardly see this great continent filled with people so that our servants will still desire freedom to plant for themselves, and not stay but for very great wages." Capitalistic social relations have always been based on compulsion, and they require as a precondition that workers possess nothing but their capacity to labour. The would-be developers of the wealth of the "New World" thus turned to forced labour in complete contradiction to all the theories of bourgeois economists because unfree labour was the only kind of labour applicable to the concrete situation in the Americas. Although slavery is now, and has almost always been equated with unfree Black labour, it was not always, or even predominantly so. Capitalists looked first to their own societies in order to find the population to labour in servitude on the large-scale plantations necessary for tropical cash crop production. Eric Williams, in his groundbreaking work Capitalism and Slavery, noted that in the early stages of colonialism "white slavery was the historic base upon which Negro [sic] slavery was constructed." Between 1607 and 1783 over a quarter million "white" indentured servants arrived in the British colonies alone where they were set to work in the agricultural and industrial processes of the time. The shipping companies, ports, and trading routes established for the transport of the poor, "criminal", and lumpen elements of European society were to form the backbone of the future slave trade of Africans. Slavery became an exclusively Black institution due to the dynamics of class struggle as repeated multi-ethnic rebellions of African slaves and indentured European servants led the slaveholders to seek strategies to divide and conquer. The fact that an African slave could be purchased for life with the same amount of money that it would cost to buy an indentured servant for 10 years, and that the African's skin color would function as an instrument of social control by making it easier to track down runaway slaves in a land where all whites were free wage labourers and all Black people slaves, provided further incentives for this system of racial classification. In the colonies where there was an insufficient free white population to provide a counterbalance to potential slave insurgencies, such as on the Caribbean islands, an elaborate hierarchy of racial privilege was built up, with the lighter skinned "mulattos" admitted to the ranks of free men where they often owned slaves themselves. The concept of a "white race" never really existed before the economic systems of early capitalism made it a necessary social construct to aid in the repression of enslaved Africans. Xenophobia and hostility towards those who were different than one's own immediate family, clan, or tribe were certainly evident, and discrimination based on religious status was also widespread but the development of modern "scientific" racism with its view that there are physically distinct "races" within humanity, with distinct attributes and characteristics is peculiar to the conquest of the Americas, the rise of slavery, and the imperialist domination of the entire world. Racism provided a convenient way to explain the subordinate position of Africans and other victims of Euro-colonialism, while at the same time providing an apparatus upon which to structure the granting of special privileges to sectors of the working class admitted as members of the "white race". As David McNally has noted, one of the key component of modern racism was its utility in resolving the contradiction as to how the modern European societies in which the bourgeoisie had come to power through promising "freedom" and "equality" were so reliant on slave labour and murderous, yet highly profitable colonial adventures. The development of a concept like racism allowed whole sections of the world's population to be "excommunicated" from humankind, and then be murdered or worked to death with a clear conscience for the profit of the capitalist class. To get a sense of the scale of slavery and its economic importance, and thus an understanding of the material incentives for the creation of ideological constructs such as "race", a few statistics regarding the English slave trade from Eric Williams' book Capitalism and Slavery help to put things in context. The Royal African Company, a monopolistic crown corporation, transported an average of 5 000 slaves a year between 1680 and 1686. When the ability to engage in the free trade of slaves was recognized as a "fundamental and natural right" of the Englishman, one port city alone, Bristol, shipped 160 950 slaves from 1698-1707. In 1760, 146 slave ships with a capacity for 36 000 slaves sailed from British ports, while in 1771 that number had increased to 190 ships with a capacity for 47 000 slaves. Between 1700 and 1786 over 610 000 slaves were imported to Jamaica alone, and conservative estimates for the total import of slaves into all British colonies between 1680 and 1786 are put at over two million. All told, many historians place the total number of Africans displaced by the Atlantic slave trade as being between twelve and thirty million people--a massive historical event and forced migration of unprecedented proportions. These large numbers of slaves and the success of the slave trade as jump starter for capitalist industrialization came from what has been called the "triangular trade"--an intensely profitable economic relationship which built up European industry while systematically deforming and underdeveloping the other economic regions involved. The Europeans would produce manufactured goods that would then be traded to ruling elites in the various African kingdoms. They in turn would use the firearms and trading goods of the Europeans to enrich themselves by capturing members of rival tribes, or the less fortunate of their own society, to sell them as slaves to the European merchants who would fill their now empty ships with slaves destined to work in the colonial plantations. On the plantations, the slaves would toil to produce expensive cash crops that could not be grown in Europe. These raw materials were then refined and sold at fantastic profit in Europe. In 1697, the tiny island of Barbados with its 166 square miles, was worth more to British capitalism than New England, New York, and Pennsylvania combined, while by 1798, the income accruing to the British from the West Indian plantations alone was four million pounds a year, as opposed to one million pounds from the whole rest of the world. Capitalist economists of the day recognized the super profitability of slavery by noting the ease of making 100% profit on the trade, and by noting that one African slave was as profitable as seven workers in the mainland. Even more importantly, the profits of the slave trade were plowed back into further economic growth. Capital from the slave trade financed James Watt and the invention and production of the steam engine, while the shipping, insurance, banking, mining, and textile industries were all thoroughly integrated into the slave trade. What an analysis of the origins of modern capitalism shows is just how far the capitalist class will go to make a profit. The development of a pernicious racist ideology, spread to justify the uprooting and enslavement of millions of people to transport them across the world to fill a land whose indigenous population was massacred or worked to death, represents the beginnings of the system that George W. Bush defends as "our way of life". For revolutionaries today who seek to understand and transform capitalism and the racism encoded into its very being, it is essential to understand how and why these systems of domination and exploitation came into being before we can hope to successfully overthrow them.

#### 4. Vote negative to adopt the historical material criticism of the 1NC - historical analysis of the material conditions of capital is the only way to break free from is contradictions and social inequalities it causes

Tumino 1 (Steven, teaches at the City University of New York, Spring, What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More Than Ever Before)

Any effective political theory will have to do at least two things: it will have to offer an integrated understanding of social practices and, based on such an interrelated knowledge, offer a guideline for praxis. My main argument here is that among all contesting social theories now, only Orthodox Marxism has been able to produce an integrated knowledge of the existing social totality and provide lines of praxis that will lead to building a society free from necessity. But first I must clarify what I mean by Orthodox Marxism. Like all other modes and forms of political theory, the very theoretical identity of Orthodox Marxism is itself contested—not just from non-and anti-Marxists who question the very "real" (by which they mean the "practical" as under free-market criteria) existence of any kind of Marxism now but, perhaps more tellingly, from within the Marxist tradition itself. I will, therefore, first say what I regard to be the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Marxism and then outline a short polemical map of contestation over Orthodox Marxism within the Marxist theories now. I will end by arguing for its effectivity in bringing about a new society based not on human rights but on freedom from necessity. I will argue that to know contemporary society—and to be able to act on such knowledge—one has to first of all know what makes the existing social totality. I will argue that the dominant social totality is based on inequality—not just inequality of power but inequality of economic access (which then determines access to health care, education, housing, diet, transportation, . . . ). This systematic inequality cannot be explained by gender, race, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, or nationality. These are all secondary contradictions and are all determined by the fundamental contradiction of capitalism which is inscribed in the relation of capital and labor. All modes of Marxism now explain social inequalities primarily on the basis of these secondary contradictions and in doing so—and this is my main argument—legitimate capitalism. Why? Because such arguments authorize capitalism without gender, race, discrimination and thus accept economic inequality as an integral part of human societies. They accept a sunny capitalism—a capitalism beyond capitalism. Such a society, based on cultural equality but economic inequality, has always been the not-so-hidden agenda of the bourgeois left—whether it has been called "new left," "postmarxism," or "radical democracy." This is, by the way, the main reason for its popularity in the culture industry—from the academy (Jameson, Harvey, Haraway, Butler,. . . ) to daily politics (Michael Harrington, Ralph Nader, Jesse Jackson,. . . ) to. . . . For all, capitalism is here to stay and the best that can be done is to make its cruelties more tolerable, more humane. This humanization (not eradication) of capitalism is the sole goal of ALL contemporary lefts (marxism, feminism, anti-racism, queeries, . . . ). Such an understanding of social inequality is based on the fundamental understanding that the source of wealth is human knowledge and not human labor. That is, wealth is produced by the human mind and is thus free from the actual objective conditions that shape the historical relations of labor and capital. Only Orthodox Marxism recognizes the historicity of labor and its primacy as the source of all human wealth. In this paper I argue that any emancipatory theory has to be founded on recognition of the priority of Marx's labor theory of value and not repeat the technological determinism of corporate theory ("knowledge work") that masquerades as social theory.

#### 5. Historical materialism must come first - it predetermines consciousness and the very possibilities of reflective thinking

**Marx 1859** (Karl, a pretty important dude. “A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy: Preface” http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1859/critique-pol-economy/preface.htm) JM

>edited for gendered language<

In the social production of their existence, [people] inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of [people] that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or – this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms – with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution. The changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure. In studying such transformations it is always necessary to distinguish between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophic – in short, ideological forms in which [people] become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as one does not judge an individual by what he thinks about himself, so one cannot judge such a period of transformation by its consciousness, but, on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the conflict existing between the social forces of production and the relations of production. No social order is ever destroyed before all the productive forces for which it is sufficient have been developed, and new superior relations of production never replace older ones before the material conditions for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society.

### Case

#### Their brand of black nationalism casts the pursuit of racial liberation in terms of a quest for masculine self-relaization – this furthers the oppression of black women – black nationalism has also been co-opted by capitalism used to futher patriarchial norms

Dyson 8 (Michael Dyson, American Civilization and Afro-American Studies—Brown University, 2008

Malcolm X and the revival of Black nationalism, <http://www.tikkun.org/archive/backissues/tik0393/tik9.html>)

Malcolm's reborn appeal is also linked to the resurgence of Black nationalism over the last two decades. Gusts of racial pride sweep across Black America as scholars retrieve the lost treasures of an unjustly degraded African past, continuing a project of racial reclamation begun in earnest in the 1960s but recast to fit the needs of end-of-the-century utopian nationalists, ranging from followers of Leonard Jeffries to what Huey Newton termed "pork-chop nationalists." **The Afrocentric movement has quickened the debate about multicultural education and cast a searching light upon the intellectual blindnesses and racist claims of Eurocentric scholars, even as it avoids acknowledging the romantic features of its own household.**Malcolm's unabashed love for Black history, his relentless pedagogy of racial redemption through cultural consciousness and racial self-awareness, mesh effortlessly with Black Americans' recovery of their African roots. **Malcolm's take-no-prisoners approach to racial crisis appeals to young Blacks disaffected from white society**and alienated from older Black generations whose contained style of revolt owes more to Martin Luther King, Jr.'s nonviolent philosophy than to X's advocacy of self-defense. Rap music has adopted Malcolm's militant posture, while exaggerating to shrill effect the already disturbing machismo and misogyny that laced his early rhetoric. **Malcolm's articulation of Black rage**--which, by his own confession, tapped a vulnerability even in Martin Luther King, Jr.--**is the centerpiece of much of rap rhetoric, replacing a concrete politics aimed at renewing the conditions of social and moral decadence it graphically portrays.Ironically, the venting of anger, while cathartic and at moments even healthy, ultimately betrays the monumental task of supplying strategic alternatives to the unstinting suffering of aggrieved Blacks. If the reemergence of Black nationalism and Malcolm's explosive popularity go hand in hand--are parallel responses to the continuing plague of an equally rejuvenated racism**--**then not only their strengths, but their limitations as well are mutually revealing.** For example, Malcolm's brand of Black nationalism was not only a fierce attack on white Americans, but a sharp rebuke as well to Black women. A product of his times, Malcolm went to extremes in demonizing women, saying that the "closest thing to a woman is a devil." Although he later amended his beliefs, confessing his regret at "spit[ting] acid at the sisters" and contending that they should be treated equally, Malcolm's Black nationalist heirs have failed to take his reformed position on gender seriously. Like the early Malcolm and other sixties nationalists, contemporary Black nationalists have cast the pursuit of racial liberation in terms of a quest for masculine self-realization. Such a strategy not only borrows ideological capital from the white patriarchy that has historically demeaned Black America, but it blunts awareness of how the practice of patriarchy by Black men has created another class of victims within Black communities. Further, the strategy of viewing racial oppression exclusively through a male lens distorts the suffering of Black women at the hands of white society and loses focus on the especially difficult choices that befall Black women caught in a sometimes bewildering nexus of relationships based on race, class, and gender. Reducing Black suffering to its lowest common male denominator not only presumes a hierarchy of pain that removes priority from the Black female struggle; it also trivializes the analysis and actions of Black women in the realization of Black liberation. Malcolm's heirs ignored the virtues of his later, enlightened attitudes toward gender. **The cultural renaissance of Malcolm X also embodies the paradoxical nature of Black nationalist politics over the past two decades: Those most aided by its successes have rarely stuck around to witness the misery of those most hurt by its failures**. **The truth is that Black nationalist rhetoric has helped an expanding Black middle class gain increased material comfort, while Black nationalism's most desperate constituency--the working class and working poor--continue to toil in the aftermath of nationalism's unrealized political promise.Talk of Black cultural solidarity and racial loyalty has propelled the careers of intellectuals, artists, and politicians as they seek access to institutions of power and ranks of privilege as esteemed voxpopuli.Yet the irony is that the perks and rewards of success insulate them from the misery of their constituencies, cutting them off from the very people on whose behalf they claim to speak. The greatest irony of contemporary Black nationalism may be its use by members of the Black middle class to consolidate their class interests at the expense of working and poor Blacks. By refusing to take class seriously--or only half-heartedly as they decry, without irony, the moves of a self-serving Black bourgeoisie!--many nationalists discard a crucial analytical tool for exploring the causes of Black racial and economic suffering.**

#### We must reject gender oppression at every turn – any compromise is a sellout

Gordon and Gordon 95 senior lecturer in the Department of Education at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev and Gordon, general director of the Foundation for Education, 1995

[Haim and Rivca, Sartre and Evil: Guidelines for a Struggle, p. 130)

**Consider the widespread oppression of women. Every compromise with this oppression, any reconciliation with the male oppressors is a sellout**. Moreover, there is no Santa Claus who will bring women in the world justice, equality, and freedom. **What members of the women's movement and the men who support them face is a long, difficult day-to-day struggle against the basic Evil of gender oppression and exploitation of women**. Therefore, women or men who believe in a Santa Claus who will bring women justice, freedom, and equality are fools. **And those who** do not believe in Santa Claus, who **continue to struggle for freedom and equality for all women, must not flee from hating those men and those institutions that continue to oppress, exploit, debase, and degrade women.**

#### Obsession with White Supremacy is bad – white racists have mastered that game. The result of their project is to reinscribe whites as the principal point of reference.

West, ultimate badass, 1993 [Cornel, Race Matters, p. 98-99]

**The project of black** separatism -- to which Malcolm X was beholden for most of his life after his first psychic conversion to the Nation of Islam -- **suffered from deep intellectual and organizational problems**. Unlike Malcolm X's notion of psychic conversion, Elijah **Muhammad's idea of religious conversion was predicated on an obsession with white supremacy. The basic aim of black Muslim theology** -- with its distinct black supremacist account of the origins of white people -- **was to counter white supremacy**. **Yet this** preoccupation with white supremacy **still allowed** white people **to serve as the** principal point of reference**. That which fundamentally motivates one still dictates the terms of what one thinks and does** -- **so the motivation of a black supremacist doctrine reveals how obsessed one is with white supremacy. This is understandable** in a white racist society -- **but it is crippling for a despised people struggling for freedom, in that** one's eyes should be on the prize, not **on the perpetuator of one's oppression. In short**, Elijah **Muhammad's project remained captive to the supremacy game** -- **a game mastered by the white racists he opposed and imitated with his black supremacy doctrine**.

#### Placing blackness as oppositional denies it any existence independent of white supremacy and makes identity reliant on opression – this turns their aff

Pinn 4 (Anthony, Macalester College Professor of Religious Studies, Dialog: A Journal of Theology, Volume 43, Number 1, Spring 2004, '‘‘Black Is, Black Ain’t’’: Victor Anderson, African American Theological Thought, and Identity', pg.57-58, Wiley online Library)

This connection between ontological blackness and religion is natural because: ‘‘ontological blackness sig- nifies the totality of black existence, a binding together of black life and experience. In its root, religio, religion denotes tying together, fastening behind, and binding¶ together. Ontological blackness renders black life and experience a totality.’’13 According to Anderson, Black theological discussions are entangled in ontological blackness. And accordingly, discussions of black life revolve around a theological understanding of Black experience limited to suffering and survival in a racist system. The goal of this theology is to find the ‘‘mean- ing of black faith’’ in the merger of black cultural consciousness, icons of genius, and post-World War II Black defiance. An admirable goal to be sure, but here is the rub: Black theologians speak, according to Anderson, in opposition to ontological whiteness when they are actually dependent upon whiteness for the legitimacy of their agenda. Furthermore, onto- logical blackness’s strong ties to suffering and survival result in blackness being dependent on suffering, and as a result social transformation brings into question what it means to be black and religious. Liberative outcomes ultimately force an identity crisis, a crisis of legitimation and utility. In Anderson’s words:¶ Talk about liberation becomes hard to justify where freedom appears as nothing more than defiant self-assertion of a revolutionary racial consciousness that requires for its legitimacy the opposition of white racism. Where there exists no possibility of transcending the black- ness that whiteness created, African American theologies of liberation must be seen not only as crisis theologies; they remain theologies in a crisis of legitimation.14 This conversation becomes more ‘‘refined’’ as new cultural resources are unpacked and various religious alternatives acknowledged. Yet the bottom line remains racialization of issues and agendas, life and love. Falsehood is perpetuated through the ‘‘herme- neutic of return,’’ by which ontological blackness is the paradigm of Black existence and thereby sets the agenda of Black liberation within the ‘‘postrevolu- tionary context’’ of present day USA. One ever finds the traces of the Black aesthetic which pushes for a dwarfed understanding of Black life and a sacrifice of individuality for the sake of a unified Black ‘faith’. Yet differing experiences of racial oppression (the stuff of ontological blackness) combined with vary- ing experiences of class, gender and sexual oppres- sion call into question the value of their racialized formulations. Implicit in all of this is a crisis of faith, an unwillingness to address both the glory and guts of Black existence—nihilistic tendencies that, unless held in tension with claims of transcendence, have the potential to overwhelm and to suffocate. At the heart of this dilemma is friction between ontological blackness and ‘‘contemporary postmo- dern black life’’—issues, for example related to ‘‘selecting marriage partners, exercising freedom of movement, acting on gay and lesbian preferences, or choosing political parties.’’15 How does one foster balance while embracing difference as positive? Anderson looks to Nietzsche.

#### Referring to the “black body” as a site of contestation in physical objectified terms is part of a duality that elevates the white mind and justifies further oppression.

Alley-Young 8 (July 2008, Gordon Alley-Young, Assistant Professor in the Department of Communications and Performing Arts at Kingsborough Community College-City University of New York, “Articulating Identity: Refining Postcolonial and Whiteness Perspectives on Race within Communication Studies,” The Review of Communication Vol. 8, No. 3, July 2008)

Descartes’ (1968) mind-body dichotomy holds that the body is divisible into its constitutive parts but that the mind is not. Postcolonial writers adapt Descartes’ (1968) dichotomy to explain how the colonial relationship situated whites and natives. In the postcolonial dichotomy white represents the mind and logic, perceiving natives as physical and illogical bodies requiring domination and control. Mohanram (1999, p. 15) cites claims of a ‘‘European universal subject’’ in colonial discourse. Such claims position white colonials as mobile, transportable, and logical as compared to the native person who is fixed to physical place and illogical. Such thinking allowed imperial nations to justify colonization as imposing logic and order on what they perceived to be illogical and underdeveloped people.¶ The postcolonial mind body dichotomy leaves the dimensions of the white body undeveloped. Dyer (1997, p. 6) describes experiencing his white body as ‘‘tightness, with self-control, self-consciousness, mind over body’’ when dancing among black bodies. Dyer’s (1997) comments suggest an experience of the white body that is informed by Cartesian thought. However, Dyer (1997) also seems to suggest that this white􏰀black physical difference is a reality, even if a socially constructed reality, while postcolonialism is suspect of such distinctions. Postcolonial writer Fanon (1967, p. 129) cites a frustrated friend who states, ‘‘When the whites feel that they have become too mechanized, they turn to the man of colour . . . for a little human sustenance.’’¶ In conflating whiteness with the mind this dichotomy suggests a rational, logical, and absent white body. The colonial perspective views the mind’s control over the white body as preferable to the body acting on its own physical impulses. The colonial perspective seeks to restrain, regulate, and/or educate the native body. The problem, Mohanram (1999) notes, is that the dichotomy reifies white colonialists’ belief that the white mind can develop but the black body cannot. This dichotomy negates native subjectivity by making natives physical bodies and thus objects that can be owned by the colonizer. Banton (2002) notes that, despite all the differences inherent in the colonial relationship, it was ‘‘complexion that came above all to serve as the sign of where a person belonged in the new social order’’ (p. 25). The black body became an object owned by this new social order. The dichotomy is a hierarchy but also a separation of subject from object.¶ One consequence of communicating about the native/black body as a physical object is that natives become hyper-sexualized (Mohanram, 1999) in the white imagination as sexually endowed (Dyer, 1997) and/or sexually violent (Fanon, 1967). Such myths reinforced colonizers’ resolve to control and restrict native bodies. This consequence surfaces in white, female colonists’ preoccupation with saving the native woman (Gandhi, 1998; Mohanram, 1999; Trinh, 1986/1987a, 1986/1987b). Colonial women perceived native men to be violent, oppressive tyrants and the native woman to be ignorant of their own oppression, thus requiring the help of enlightened, white, western women. This paternalistic thinking ignores native women’s strong cultural allegiances and views native culture as physically oppressive and needing western intervention.

#### They cast Blacks as passive victims – this framing gets manipulated to legitimize a new wave of antiblackness

Muhwati 5 (Itai Muhwati is a Lecturer in the Department of African Languages and Literature at the University of Zimbabwe, “Mass Neurosis, Entrapment, Closure and the Race’s Race of Life in Masango Mavi (1998) and Mapenzi (1999)” http://www.researchgate.net/publication/43090930\_Mass\_Neurosis\_Entrapment\_Closure\_and\_the\_Races\_Race\_of\_Life\_in\_Masango\_Mavi%281998%29\_and\_Mapenzi\_%281999%29

The African image in quite a number of literary creations in Zimbabwean literature is palpably bedridden in intensive care. This image finds revelation in the titles themselves. The physical wreckage and spiritual paralysis that is by definition an expression of this image, leads to an agonising realisation that, in life’s vicissitudes, and life’s race of race survival, African people remain undeveloped § Marked 10:23 § and fledgling stutters. The images of characters in these novels whose titles are vapid project Africans as victims of collective inertia, wallowing in cultural and historical amnesia and disintegrating in irretrievable mentacide. As a result, in terms of agency and mobility, the African race remains glued on the starting line, quite overwhelmed by the seemingly insurmountable hurdles in the race of life. Through the choice of titles, most of the writers seem to have adopted a modality that inordinately projects social death and a host of other social sicknesses as new forms of social identity in the contemporary dispensation. While their absolutisation of mass neurosis, closure and entrapment might be said to be a reflection of the state of the nation in the post independence period, it is also estimable that such images of social sickness, paralysis and mass neurosis can be manipulated by Africa’s anthropological detractors in their justification of a static and back pedalling African race, particularly along the evolutionary spectrum, which is presented as a universal standard of valuation. The paper also puts forth argument that, the adoption of an axiological paradigm that legitimises closure and race entrapment nullifies any prospects towards racial salvation. It is an act of defining the African race as doomed. Such a definition which trivialises the African existential trajectory pays homage to the subversive labels that Europe has generously donated to Africa. Such labels include Third World; Underdeveloped; Dark Continent; Poor majority, cultural other and many more. These are designations that bespeak helplessness and mass neurosis.

## 2NC

### Case

#### Questions of method come first – status quo empiricism constructs an image of the world that it equates with truth. This refactors women into sex objects.

MacKinnon 82 Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State: An Agenda for Theory Author(s): Catharine A. MacKinnon Reviewed work(s): Source: Signs, Vol. 7, No. 3, Feminist Theory (Spring, 1982), pp. 515-544 Published by: The University of Chicago Press Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3173853 . Accessed: 10/11/2011 16:57 University of Michigan (Elizabeth A. Long Professor of Law, 1989–) York University (Professor of Law, 1988–1989) various universities (Visiting Professor, 1984–1988) University of Minnesota (Assistant Professor of Law, 1982–1984)

Through consciousness raising, women grasp the collective reality of women's condition from within the perspective of that experience, not from outside it. The claim that a sexual politics exists and is socially fundamental is grounded in the claim of feminism to women's perspective, not from it. Its claim to women's perspective is its claim to truth. In its account of itself, women's point of view contains a duality analogous to that of the marxist proletariat: determined by the reality the theory explodes, it thereby claims special access to that reality.51 Feminism does not see its view as subjective, partial, or undetermined but as a critique of the purported generality, disinterestedness, and universality of prior accounts. These have not been half right but have invoked the wrong whole. Feminism not only challenges masculine partiality but questions the universality imperative itself. Aperspectivity is revealed as a strategy of male hegemony.52 "Representation of the world," de Beauvoir writes, "like the world itself, is the work of men; they describe it from their own point of view, which they confuse with the absolute truth."53 The parallel between representation and construction should be sustained: men create the world from their own point of view, which then becomes the truth to be described. This is a closed system, not anyone's confusion. Power to create the world from one's point of view is power in its male form.54 The male epistemological stance, which corresponds to the world it creates, is objectivity: the ostensibly noninvolved stance, the view from a distance and from no particular perspective, apparently transparent to its reality. It does not comprehend its own perspectivity, does not recognize what it sees as subject like itself, or that the way it apprehends its world is a form of its subjugation and presupposes it. The objectively knowable is object. Woman through male eyes is sex object, that by which man knows himself at once as man and as subject.55 What is objectively known corresponds to the world and can be verified by pointing to it (as science does) because the world itself is controlled from the same point of view. Combining, like any form of power, legitimation with force, male power extends beneath the representation of reality to its construction: it makes women (as it were) and so verifies (makes true) who women "are" in its view, simultaneously confirming its way of being and its vision of truth. that corresponds to this is "the use of things to experience self."57 As a coerced pornography model put it, "You do it, you do it, and you do it; then you become it."58 The fetish speaks feminism. Objectification makes sexuality a material reality of women's lives, not just a psychological, attitudinal, or ideological one.59 It obliterates the mind/matter distinction that such a division is premised upon. Like the value of a commodity, women's sexual desirability is fetishized: it is made to appear a quality of the object itself, spontaneous and inherent, independent of the social relation which creates it, uncontrolled by the force that requires it. It helps if the object cooperates: hence, the vaginal orgasm;60 hence, faked orgasms altogether.61 Women's sexualness, like male prowess, is no less real for being mythic. It is embodied. Commodities do have value, but only because value is a social property arising from the totality of the same social relations which, unconscious of their determination, fetishize it. Women's bodies possess no less real desirability-or, probably, desire. Sartre exemplifies the problem on the epistemological level: "But if I desire a house, or a glass of water, or a woman's body, how could this body, this glass, this piece of property reside in my desire and how can my desire be anything but the consciousness of these objects as desirable?"62 Indeed. Objectivity is the methodological stance of which objectification is the social process. Sexual objectification is the primary process of the subjection of women. It unites act with word, construction with expression, perception with enforcement, myth with reality. Man fucks woman; subject verb object. The distinction between objectification and alienation is called into question by this analysis. Objectification in marxist materialism is thought to be the foundation of human freedom, the work process whereby a subject becomes embodied in products and relationships.63 Alienation is the socially contingent distortion of that process, a reification of products and relations which prevents them from being, and being seen as, dependent on human agency.64 But from the point of view of the object, objectification is alienation. For women, there is no distinction between objectification and alienation because women have not authored objectifications, we have been them. Women have been the nature, the matter, the acted upon, to be subdued by the acting subject seeking to embody himself in the social world. Reification is not just an illusion to the reified; it is also their reality. The alienated who can only grasp self as other is no different from the object who can only grasp self as thing. To be man's other is to be his thing. Similarly, the problem of how the object can know herself as such is the same as how the alienated can know its own alienation. This, in turn, poses the problem of feminism's account of women's consciousness. How can women, as created, "thingified in the head,"65 complicit in the body, see our condition as such? In order to account for women's consciousness (much less propagate it) feminism must grasp that male power produces the world before it distorts it. Women's acceptance of their condition does not contradict its fundamental unacceptability if women have little choice but to become persons who freely choose women's roles. For this reason, the reality of women's oppression is, finally, neither demonstrable nor refutable empirically. Until this is confronted on the level of method, criticism of what exists can be undercut by pointing to the reality to be criticized. Women's bondage, degradation, damage, complicity, and inferiority together with the possibility of resistance, movement, or exceptions-will operate as barriers to consciousness rather than as means of access to what women need to become conscious of in order to change. Male power is real; it is just not what it claims to be, namely, the only reality. Male power is a myth that makes itself true. What it is to raise consciousness is to confront male power in this duality: as total on one side and a delusion on the other. In consciousness raising, women learn they have learned that men are everything, women their negation, but that the sexes are equal. The content of the message is revealed true and false at the same time; in fact, each part reflects the other transvalued. If "men are all, women their negation" is taken as social criticism rather than simple description, it becomes clear for the first time that women are men's equals, everywhere in chains. Their chains become visible, their inferiority-their inequality-a product of subjection and a mode of its enforcement. Reciprocally, the moment it is seen that this-life as we know it-is not equality, that the sexes are not socially equal, womanhood can no longer be defined in terms of lack of maleness, as negativity. For the first time, the question of what a woman is seeks its ground in and of a world understood as neither of its making nor in its image, and finds, within a critical embrace of woman's fractured and alien image, that world women have made and a vision of its wholeness. Feminism has unmasked maleness as a form of power that is both omnipotent and nonexistent, an unreal thing with very real consequences.

#### The rationale that the affirmative relies upon is one that devalues women and feminized Others – this marginalizes people based on gender, race, and class standing

Peterson 5 **[**V. Spike, Professor at the Department of Political Science With courtesy affiliations in Women’s Studies, International Studies,  Institute for LGBT Studies, Comparative Cultural and Literary Studies,  and Center for Latin American Studies Associate Fellow, Gender Institute, London School of Economics “How (the Meaning of) Gender Matters in Political Economy” New Political Economy, Vol. 10, No. 4, December 2005, http://www.u.arizona.edu/~spikep/Publications/VSP%20GenderMatters%20NPE%202005.pdf]/]

Moreover, to investigate the interconnections among structural hierarchies I deploy gender analytically, arguing that denigration of the feminine (coded into masculinist/modernist dichotomies as hierarchical) pervades language and culture, with systemic effects on how we ‘take for granted’ (normalise/depoliticise) the devaluation of feminised bodies, identities and activities. This has particular relevance for economics, where assessments of ‘value’ are key. I argue that feminisation of identities and practices effectively devalues them in cultural as well as economic terms. Brieﬂy: the taken-for-granted devaluation of ‘women’s work’ is generalised from women to include feminised ‘others’: migrants, How (the Meaning of) Gender Matters 507marginalised populations, ‘unskilled’ workers, the urban underclass and developing countries. Women and feminised others constitute the vast majority of the world’s population, as well as the vast majority of poor, less skilled, insecure, informalised and ﬂexibilised workers; and the global economy absolutely depends on the work that they do. Yet their work is variously unpaid, underpaid, trivialised, denigrated, obscured and uncounted: it is devalorised. This economic devalorisation is either hardly noticed or deemed ‘acceptable’ because it is consistent with cultural devalorisation of that which is feminised. The key point here is that feminisation devalorises not only women but also racially, culturally and economically marginalised men and work that is deemed unskilled, menial and ‘merely’ reproductive.

### 2NC Overview

#### We must reject gender oppression at every turn – any compromise is a sellout

Gordon and Gordon 95 senior lecturer in the Department of Education at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev and Gordon, general director of the Foundation for Education, 1995

[Haim and Rivca, Sartre and Evil: Guidelines for a Struggle, p. 130)

**Consider the widespread oppression of women. Every compromise with this oppression, any reconciliation with the male oppressors is a sellout**. Moreover, there is no Santa Claus who will bring women in the world justice, equality, and freedom. **What members of the women's movement and the men who support them face is a long, difficult day-to-day struggle against the basic Evil of gender oppression and exploitation of women**. Therefore, women or men who believe in a Santa Claus who will bring women justice, freedom, and equality are fools. **And those who** do not believe in Santa Claus, who **continue to struggle for freedom and equality for all women, must not flee from hating those men and those institutions that continue to oppress, exploit, debase, and degrade women.**

#### Their characterizations of race that categorize everything as part of a Black/White paradigm – this excludes Latinas from analysis, which reproduces racism

Perea 97 [Professor of Law, University of Florida College of Law, Juan, RACE, ETHNICITY & NATIONHOOD: ARTICLE: The Black/White Binary Paradigm of Race: The "Normal Science" of American Racial Thought, California Law Review, October, 1997, 85 Calif. L. Rev. 1213, p. 1214-1216]

[\*1214] This Article is about how we are taught to think about race. In particular, I intend to analyze the role of books and texts on race in structuring our racial discourse. I believe that much writing on racism is structured by a paradigm that is widely held but rarely recognized for what it is and what it does. This paradigm shapes our understanding of what race and racism mean and the nature of our discussions about race. **It is crucial,** therefore, **to identify and describe** this paradigm and to demonstrate how it binds and organizes racial discourse, limiting both the scope and the range of legitimate viewpoints in that discourse. In this Article, I identify and criticize one of the most salient features of past and current discourse about race in the United States, **the Black/White binary paradigm of race**. A small but growing number of writers have recognized the paradigm and its limiting effect on racial discourse. n2 I believe that its dominant and pervasive character has not been well established nor discussed in legal literature. I intend to demonstrate the existence of a Black/White paradigm and to show its breadth and seemingly pervasive ordering of racial [\*1215] discourse and legitimacy. Further, I intend to show how **the Black/White binary paradigm operates to exclude Latinos/as** n3 **from full membership and participation in racial discourse, and** how **that exclusion serves to perpetuate not only the paradigm itself but also negative stereotypes of Latinos/as**. **Full membership in society for Latinos/as will require a paradigm shift away from the binary paradigm and towards a new and evolving understanding of race and race relations.** This Article illustrates the kind of contribution to critical theory that **the** emergent Latino Critical Race Studies (**LatCrit**) movement may make. This **movement is a continuing scholarly effort**, undertaken by Latino/a scholars and other sympathetic scholars, **to examine critically existing structures of racial thought and to identify how these structures perpetuate the subordinated position of Latinos/as in particular**. LatCrit studies are, then, an extension and development of critical race theory (and critical theory generally) that focus on the previously neglected areas of Latino/a identity and history and the role of racism as it affects Latinos/as. I identify strongly, and self-consciously, as a Latino writer and thinker. It is precisely my position as a Latino outsider, neither Black nor White, that makes possible the observation and critique presented in this Article. **My critique of the Black/White binary paradigm of race shows this commonly held binary understanding of race to be one of the major impediments to learning about and understanding Latinos/as and their history.** As I shall show, **the paradigm also creates** significant distortions **in the way people learn to view Latinos/as.** I begin with a review of the principal scientific theory that describes the nature of paradigms and the power they exert over the formation of knowledge. I then analyze important, nationally recognized books on race to reveal the binary paradigm of race and the way it structures race thinking. After reviewing these popular and scholarly books on race, I analyze a leading casebook on constitutional law. Like other books, textbooks on constitutional law are shaped by the paradigm and reproduce it. Then, by describing some of the legal struggles Latinos/as have waged, I will demonstrate that **paradigmatic presentations of race and struggles for equality have caused significant omissions with undesirable repercussions.** Thus, I demonstrate the important role that legal history [\*1216] can play in both correcting and amplifying the Black/White binary paradigm of race.

#### They reify negative racial categories

Leong, Assistant Professor, William and Mary School of Law, 2010

[Nancy, JUDICIAL ERASURE OF MIXED-RACE DISCRIMINATION, AMERICAN UNIVERSITY LAW REVIEW, Vol. 59, 59 Am. U. L. Rev. 469, p. 551]

**Multiracial individuals** have long vexed courts and commentators because they challenge and **confound existing racial categories**. **Despite the recognition that multiracial individuals have received** in some contexts, **the reliance** of antidiscrimination jurisprudence **on categories has generally excluded plaintiffs identified as multiracial. This absence obscures animus directed at multiracial individuals**. Moreover, **the dominance of racial categories calcifies existing racial classifications and the stereotypes associated with them, preventing society from moving beyond these arbitrary categories**.

### Doing both

#### Understanding of the Black-White relationship doesn’t promote understandings of other racisms

Perea 97 [Professor of Law, University of Florida College of Law, Juan, RACE, ETHNICITY & NATIONHOOD: ARTICLE: The Black/White Binary Paradigm of Race: The "Normal Science" of American Racial Thought, California Law Review, October, 1997, 85 Calif. L. Rev. 1213, p. 1237]

**The very conscious recognition and use** of White-against-Black racism as a paradigm, while a significant step towards clarity in the intellectual tools we use to understand racism, also **has its limitations**. Feagin and Vera assert that deeper inquiry into the paradigmatic relationship is a necessary condition for understanding the racism experienced by any other racialized American minority group. They assert, in essence, that normal, paradigmatic research is the key to solving pervasive, multiple racisms. **The Black/White paradigm, thus asserted, may become an even more unyielding and impenetrable form of study and discourse than it was before. All other racial studies must be dependent upon the results of "normal" science**. In my view, **Feagin and Vera are wrong in asserting that a deeper understanding of the Black-White relationship will necessarily promote understanding of the particularities of other racisms**. I agree with Feagin and Vera that an understanding of White-against-Black racism may be helpful in understanding the deployment of racism against other non-Whites, for example in understanding the persistent use and tolerance of segregation against non-White peoples. However, **an exclusive focus on the Black-White relationship, and the concomitant margin-alization of "other people of color," can operate to prevent understanding of other racisms and to obscure their particular operation. For example, the attribution of foreignness to Latinos/as and Asian Americans**, or discrimination on the basis of language or accent, **are powerful dynamics as played out against these groups that do** not [\*1238] **appear to be as significant in the dynamics of White-against-Black racism**. n114

#### Racism against Latinas is different – structuring it through the lens of Black/White racism reinforces ignorance about Latinas

Perea 97 [Professor of Law, University of Florida College of Law, Juan, RACE, ETHNICITY & NATIONHOOD: ARTICLE: The Black/White Binary Paradigm of Race: The "Normal Science" of American Racial Thought, California Law Review, October, 1997, 85 Calif. L. Rev. 1213, p. 1253-1254]

**One could defend the Black/White paradigm on the grounds that it represents** the efforts of scholars to study **the most virulent form of racism in the United States**, White racism against Blacks, and that study of the most virulent form will naturally encompass less virulent forms such as those experienced by Latinos/as. The extent of White racism against Blacks, cruelly manifested in slavery, was unprecedented. Pervasive and continuing racism against Blacks justifies every effort dedicated to its eradication. **There are at least three reasons, however, why an exclusive focus on Blacks and Whites is not justified**. **First, it is important to work to eradicate all racism, not just the racism experienced by Blacks**. **Second, it is wrong to assume that racism against Latinos/as is simply a less virulent form of the same racism experienced by Blacks.** As Blauner described, racism against **Latinos/as has a different genesis**. It may also be different in kind in ways that are very important. For example, Blacks may or may not ever experience the language and accent discrimination faced by many Latinos/as. **Finally, our national demographics are changing significantly. One cannot simply ignore the concerns of an increasingly** [\*1254] **large and subordinated group of Latinos/as** forever. A society is just only if everyone can participate in it on equal terms. Some readers might object that Latinos/as are now, late in the game, attempting to lay claim to civil rights already hard won by Blacks after long struggle. I think the abbreviated slice of Mexican-American legal history presented in this article begins to refute this argument. In fact, Mexican Americans can lay claim to a long struggle for civil rights. Ironically, **it is largely because of the Black/White paradigm of race that more people do not learn Mexican-American and other Latino/a history in the United States**. **So readers and scholars must begin to ask whether Latinos/as are invisible because they have not participated in social struggle or because scholars have been indifferent and have neglected to tell the stories of their presence and participation in social struggle.** I suggest that the latter is the more accurate explanation.

#### The perfunctory references they make to people of color are proof of our link

Perea, Professor of Law, University of Florida College of Law, 1997

[Juan, RACE, ETHNICITY & NATIONHOOD: ARTICLE: The Black/White Binary Paradigm of Race:

The "Normal Science" of American Racial Thought, California Law Review, October, 1997, 85 Calif. L. Rev. 1213, p. 1257-1258]

**Paradigmatic descriptions and study of White racism against Blacks, with only cursory mention of "other people of color," marginalizes all people of color by grouping them,** without particularity**, as somehow analogous to Blacks**. "Other people of color" are deemed to exist only as unexplained analogies to Blacks. Thus, **scholars encourage uncritical readers to continue to assume the paradigmatic importance of the Black/White relationship and to ignore the experiences of other Americans who also are subject to racism in profound ways**. **Critical readers are left with many important questions: Beyond the most superficial understanding of aversion to non-White skin color, in what ways is White racism against Blacks explanatory of or analogous to White racism against Latinos/as, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and others**? Given the unique historical legacy of slavery, what does a deep understanding of White-Black racism contribute to understanding rac-isms against other "Others?" **Why are "other people of color" consistently relegated to parenthetical status and near-nonexistence in treatises purporting to cover their fields comprehensively?** It is time to ask hard questions of our leading writers on race. **It is** also **time to demand better answers to these questions about inclusion, exclusion, and racial presence, than perfunctory references to "other people of color**." **In the midst of profound demographic changes, it is time to question whether the Black/White binary paradigm of race fits our highly variegated current and future population. Our "normal science" of writing on race, at odds with both history and demographic reality, needs reworking**.

### Links

#### \*\*\*Teaching racism through the Black/White paradigm renders Latino history invisible

Perea 97 [Professor of Law, University of Florida College of Law, Juan, RACE, ETHNICITY & NATIONHOOD: ARTICLE: The Black/White Binary Paradigm of Race: The "Normal Science" of American Racial Thought, California Law Review, October, 1997, 85 Calif. L. Rev. 1213, p. 1253-1254]

**One could defend the Black/White paradigm on the grounds that it represents** the efforts of scholars to study **the most virulent form of racism in the United States**, White racism against Blacks, and that study of the most virulent form will naturally encompass less virulent forms such as those experienced by Latinos/as. The extent of White racism against Blacks, cruelly manifested in slavery, was unprecedented. Pervasive and continuing racism against Blacks justifies every effort dedicated to its eradication. **There are at least three reasons, however, why an exclusive focus on Blacks and Whites is not justified**. **First, it is important to work to eradicate all racism, not just the racism experienced by Blacks**. **Second, it is wrong to assume that racism against Latinos/as is simply a less virulent form of the same racism experienced by Blacks.** As Blauner described, racism against **Latinos/as has a different genesis**. It may also be different in kind in ways that are very important. For example, Blacks may or may not ever experience the language and accent discrimination faced by many Latinos/as. **Finally, our national demographics are changing significantly. One cannot simply ignore the concerns of an increasingly** [\*1254] **large and subordinated group of Latinos/as** forever. A society is just only if everyone can participate in it on equal terms. Some readers might object that Latinos/as are now, late in the game, attempting to lay claim to civil rights already hard won by Blacks after long struggle. I think the abbreviated slice of Mexican-American legal history presented in this article begins to refute this argument. In fact, Mexican Americans can lay claim to a long struggle for civil rights. Ironically, **it is largely because of the Black/White paradigm of race that more people do not learn Mexican-American and other Latino/a history in the United States**. **So readers and scholars must begin to ask whether Latinos/as are invisible because they have not participated in social struggle or because scholars have been indifferent and have neglected to tell the stories of their presence and participation in social struggle.** I suggest that the latter is the more accurate explanation.

#### The impact is an expansion of domination

Wildman, Professor of Law, USF School of Law, and Davis, Associate Professor of Law, American University, Washington College of the Law, 1994

[Stephanie and Adrienne, ESSAY: LANGUAGE AND SILENCE: MAKING SYSTEMS OF PRIVILEGE VISIBLE, Santa Clara Law Review, 35 Santa Clara L. Rev. 881

Professor Adrienne Davis has explained:

**Domination, subordination, and privilege are like three heads of a hydra**. **Attacking the most visible heads, domination and subordination**, trying bravely to chop them up into little pieces, **will not kill the third head, privilege**. **Like a mythic multi-headed hydra, which will inevitably grow another head, if all heads are not slain**, **discrimination cannot be ended by focusing only on** ... **subordination and domination**. n29 **Subordination will grow back from the ignored head of privilege**, yet the descriptive vocabulary and conceptualization of discrimination hinders our ability to see the hydra-head of privilege. This invisibility is serious because that which is not seen cannot be discussed or changed. **Thus, to end subordination, one must first recognize privilege**. **Seeing privilege means articulating a new vocabulary and structure for anti-subordination theory**. **Only by visualizing this privilege and incorporating it into discourse can people of good faith combat discrimination**.

#### Attempting to understand Latino/as through analogies to black oppression erases specific forms of oppression

Perea, Professor of Law, University of Florida College of Law, 1997

[Juan, RACE, ETHNICITY & NATIONHOOD: ARTICLE: The Black/White Binary Paradigm of Race:

The "Normal Science" of American Racial Thought, California Law Review, October, 1997, 85 Calif. L. Rev. 1213, p. 1239]

Robert **Blauner**, writing in 1972, **recognized and forcefully criticized the Black/White binary paradigm**. n118 **His critique may be applied generally to scholars who have embraced and reified the binary paradigm while ignoring greater actual racial complexity.** Blauner noted that Mexican Americans cannot be understood within the confines of the Black/White paradigm nor the model of immigration and assimilation: **The encounter between Mexican-Americans and the United States** is sui generis, it **cannot be forced into the ethnic model of immigration-assimilation nor into the category of black/white relations**. **That is why Chicanos, painfully aware of their unique history, resent and resist being classified, interpreted, or "understood" through analogs with the Afro-American**. n119

## 1NR

### Cap K

### Prioritization

#### History validates our claims.

McLaren and Torres 99 (Peter Mclaren, professor of education at U of California, and Rudolfo Torres, Professor of Planning, Policy, and Design, Chicano/Latino Studies, and Political Science, “Racism and Multicultural Education: Rethinking ‘Race’ and ‘Whiteness’ in Late Capitalism”, Chapter 2 of “Critical Multiculturalism: Rethinking Multicultural and Antiracist Education”, edited by Stephen May, p.49-50, Questia)

According to Alex Callinicos (1993), racial differences are invented. Racism occurs when the characteristics which justify discrimination are held to be inherent in the oppressed group. This form of oppression is peculiar to capitalist societies; it arises in the circumstances surrounding industrial capitalism and the attempt to acquire a large labour force. Callinicos points out three main conditions for the existence of racism as outlined by Marx: economic competition between workers; the appeal of racist ideology to white workers; and efforts of the capitalist class to establish and maintain racial divisions among workers. Capital's constantly changing demands for different kinds of labour can only be met through immigration. Callinicos remarks that 'racism offers for workers of the oppressing “race” the imaginary compensation for the exploitation they suffer of belonging to the “ruling nation”' (1993, p. 39). Callinicos notes the way in which Marx grasped how 'racial' divisions between 'native' and 'immigrant' workers could weaken the working-class. United States' politicians like Pat Buchanan, Jesse Helms and Pete Wilson, to name but a few, take advantage of this division which the capitalist class understands and manipulates only too well-using racism effectively to divide the working-class. At this point you might be asking yourselves: Doesn't racism pre-date capitalism? Here we agree with Callinicos that the heterophobia associated with precapitalist societies was not the same as modern racism. Pre-capitalist slave and feudal societies of classical Greece and Rome did not rely on racism to justify the use of slaves. The Greeks and Romans did not have theories of white superiority. If they did, that must have been unsettling news to Septimus Severus, Roman Emperor from Ad 193 to 211, who was, many historians claim, a black man. Racism emerged during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries from a key development of capitalism-colonial plantations in the New World where slave labour stolen from Africa was used to produce tobacco, sugar, and cotton for the global consumer market (Callinicos, 1993). Callinicos cites Eric Williams who remarks: 'Slavery was not born of racism: rather, racism was the consequence of slavery' (cited in Callinicos, 1993, p. 24). In effect, racism emerged as the ideology of the plantocracy. It began with the class of sugar-planters and slave merchants that dominated England's Caribbean colonies. Racism developed out of the 'systemic slavery' of the New World. The 'natural inferiority' of Africans was a way that Whites justified enslaving them. According to Callinicos: Racism offers white workers the comfort of believing themselves part of the dominant group; it also provides, in times of crisis, a ready-made scapegoat, in the shape of the oppressed group. Racism thus gives white workers a particular identity, and one which unites them with white capitalists. We have here, then, a case of the kind of 'imagined community' discussed by Benedict Anderson in his influential analysis of nationalism. (1993, p. 38) In short, to abolish racism in any substantive sense, we need to abolish global capitalism

### Alternative

#### A materialist method is key - illumination of social and political relations through dialetical materialism is key to achieving class consciousness and thus stopping capitalism

Lukacs 1919 (George, Hungarian philosopher, He was the founder of Western Marxism, “What is Orthodox Marxism” http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm)

If the question were really to be formulated in terms of such a crude antithesis it would deserve at best a pitying smile. But in fact it is not (and never has been) quite so straightforward. Let us assume for the sake of argument that recent research had disproved once and for all every one of Marx’s individual theses. Even if this were to be proved, every serious ‘orthodox’ Marxist would still be able to accept all such modern findings without reservation and hence dismiss all of Marx’s theses in toto – without having to renounce his orthodoxy for a single moment. Orthodox Marxism, therefore, does not imply the uncritical acceptance of the results of Marx’s investigations. It is not the ‘belief’ in this or that thesis, nor the exegesis of a ‘sacred’ book. On the contrary, orthodoxy refers exclusively to method. It is the scientific conviction that dialectical materialism is the road to truth and that its methods can be developed, expanded and deepened only along the lines laid down by its founders. It is the conviction, moreover, that all attempts to surpass or ‘improve’ it have led and must lead to over-simplification, triviality and eclecticism. 1 Materialist dialectic is a revolutionary dialectic. This definition is so important and altogether so crucial for an understanding of its nature that if the problem is to be approached in the right way this must be fully grasped before we venture upon a discussion of the dialectical method itself. The issue turns on the question of theory and practice. And this not merely in the sense given it by Marx when he says in his first critique of Hegel that “theory becomes a material force when it grips the masses.” [[1]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm#1) Even more to the point is the need to discover those features and definitions both of the theory and the ways of gripping the masses which convert the theory, the dialectical method, into a vehicle of revolution. We must extract the practical essence of the theory from the method and its relation to its object. If this is not done that ‘gripping the masses’ could well turn out to be a will o’ the wisp. It might turn out that the masses were in the grip of quite different forces, that they were in pursuit of quite different ends. In that event, there would be no necessary connection between the theory and their activity, it would be a form that enables the masses to become conscious of their socially necessary or fortuitous actions, without ensuring a genuine and necessary bond between consciousness and action. In the same essay [[2]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm#2) Marx clearly defined the conditions in which a relation between theory and practice becomes possible. “It is not enough that thought should seek to realise itself; reality must also strive towards thought.” Or, as he expresses it in an earlier work: [[3]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm#3) “It will then be realised that the world has long since possessed something in the form of a dream which it need only take possession of consciously, in order to possess it in reality.” Only when consciousness stands in such a relation to reality can theory and practice be united. But for this to happen the emergence of consciousness must become the decisive step which the historical process must take towards its proper end (an end constituted by the wills of men, but neither dependent on human whim, nor the product of human invention). The historical function of theory is to make this step a practical possibility. Only when a historical situation has arisen in which a class must understand society if it is to assert itself; only when the fact that a class understands itself means that it understands society as a whole and when, in consequence, the class becomes both the subject and the object of knowledge; in short, only when these conditions are all satisfied will the unity of theory and practice, the precondition of the revolutionary function of the theory, become possible. Such a situation has in fact arisen with the entry of the proletariat into history. “When the proletariat proclaims the dissolution of the existing social order,” Marx declares, “it does no more than disclose the secret of its own existence, for it is the effective dissolution of that order.” [[4]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm#4) The links between the theory that affirms this and the revolution are not just arbitrary, nor are they particularly tortuous or open to misunderstanding. On the contrary, the theory is essentially the intellectual expression of the revolutionary process itself. In it every stage of the process becomes fixed so that it may be generalised, communicated, utilised and developed. Because the theory does nothing but arrest and make conscious each necessary step, it becomes at the same time the necessary premise of the following one.

#### Anti-capitalism struggle is the best means of challenging racism

McLaren and Torres 99 (Peter Mclaren, professor of education at U of California, and Rudolfo Torres, Professor of Planning, Policy, and Design, Chicano/Latino Studies, and Political Science, “Racism and Multicultural Education: Rethinking ‘Race’ and ‘Whiteness’ in Late Capitalism”, Chapter 2 of “Critical Multiculturalism: Rethinking Multicultural and Antiracist Education”, edited by Stephen May, p.69, Questia)

Capitalism in advanced western countries must be dismantled if extra-economic inequalities-such as racism and sexism-are to be challenged successfully. While it is true that people have identities other than class identities that shape their experiences in crucial and important ways, anticapitalist struggle is the best means to inform educators as to how identities can be conceived and rearticulated within the construction of a radical socialist project. As Ellen Wood notes: Capitalism is constituted by class exploitation, but capitalism is more than just a system of class oppression. It is a ruthless totalizing process which shapes our lives in every conceivable aspect, and everywhere, not just in the relative opulence of the capitalist North. Among other things, and even leaving aside the direct power wielded by capitalist wealth both in the economy and in the political sphere, it subjects all social life to the abstract requirements of the market, through the commodification of life in all its aspects, determining the allocation of labour, leisure, resources, patterns of production, consumption and the disposition of time. This makes a mockery of all our aspirations to autonomy, freedom of choice, and democratic self-government. (1995, pp. 262-3) Critical educators need to consider how racisms in their present incarnations developed out of the dominant mode of global production during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries of colonial plantations in the New World with slave labour imported from Africa to produce consumer goods such as, among others, tobacco, sugar, and cotton. How the immigrant working-class has been divided historically along racialized lines is a process that needs to be better understood and more forcefully addressed by multicultural educators. How, for instance, does racism give white workers a particular identity which unites them with white capitalists (Callinicos, 1992)

### Links

#### The divide and conquer link – Capitalism racializes subjects to divide social groups - a race and experience based epistemology and theory of oppression breaks down the concept of class as an all encompassing theory of exploitation that is the only way to enable the unification of the proleteriat

Zavarzadeh 3 (Mas’ud, “The Pedagogy of Totality” p.11-13, in “JAC: A Journal of Rhetoric, Culture, and Politics”, Volume 23.1, http://www.jaconlinejournal.com/archives/vol23.1.html)

The pedagogy of appearance focuses on cultural representation and the role of representation in constructing the represented. By centering teaching in the machinery of "representation,"it obliterates the objective. Reducing pedagogy to lessons in cultural semiotics, it makes "experi- ence" of the pleasures of "depthless" surfaces the measure of reality and thus obscures the social relations of production that are the material conditions of that experience. However, "This 'lived' experience is not a given, given by a pure 'reality,' but the spontaneous 'lived experience' of ideology in its peculiar relationship to the real" (Althusser 223). The ideological value of the concept of "experience" in de-concep-ualizing pedagogy will perhaps become more clear in examining the way bourgeois radical pedagogues, such as Giroux, deploy experience as an instance of spontaneity to eviscerate class as an explanatory concept by which the social relations ofproperty are critiqued. In his Impure A cts- a book devoted to marginalizing explanatory concepts and popularizing "hybrids" and that, in effect, justifies political opportunism in peda- gogy- Giroux repeats the claims of such other cultural phenomenologists as Stuart Hall, Judith Butler, and Robin Kelley that "class" is "lived through race" (28). Class, in other words, is an affect. He represents this affective view ofclass as epistemological resistance against class which, he claims, is a universal category that takes the "difference" ofrace out of class. As I have already argued, epistemology is used in mainstream pedagogy as a cover for a reactionary class politics that does several things, as Giroux demonstrates. First, it segregates the "black" proletariat from the "white" proletariat and isolates both :from other "racial" prole- tariats. In doing so, Giroux's pedagogy carries out the political agenda of capital - to pit one segment ofthe proletariat against the other and to tum the unity of the working class into contesting (race) "differences." Second, it rewrites the system of wage labor itself into a hybrid. Giroux's experience-ism obscures the systematicity of wage labor and argues that there is no capitalism operating with a single logic of exploitation. Instead, there are many, aleatory, ad hoc, local arrangements between employees and employers depending on the color of the worker not the laws ofmotion ofcapital. Third, it converts capitalism from an economic system based on the"exploitation"of humans by humans(wagelabor)- through the ownership ofthe means ofproduction-into an institution of cultural "oppression" based on "power." Fourth, since class is lived through race, it is not an objective fact (the relation of the worker to ownership ofthe means ofproduction) but a subjective experience. The experience of ("living") class through race, like all experiences, is contingent, aleatory, and indeterminate. Class (lived through the experi- ence of race) is thus reconstituted as contingent - an accident not a necessity of wage labor. Fifth, since capitalism is not a system but a series of ad hoc arrangements of exchange with various workers of diverse colors, it does not produce an objective binary class system but only cultural differences. One cannot, therefore, obtain objective knowledge of capitalism. There are, in short, no laws ofmotion ofcapital; there are only "experiences" ofwork influenced by one's color. Consequently, to say-as I have said-that capitalism is a regime ofexploitation is simply a totalitarian closure. We cannot know what capitalism is because, according to Giroux's logic, it is fraught with differences (ofrace) not the singularity of"surplus labor." In Giroux's pedagogy, there is no capital- ism ("totality"), only cultural effects of capitals without capitalism ("differences"). Giroux represents his gutting of class as a radical and groundbreaking notion that will lead to liberation ofthe oppressed. However, he never completes the logic of his argument because in the end it will de-ground his position and turn it into epistemological nonsense and political pantomime. Ifclass is a universal category that obliterates the difference of race, there is (on the basis of such a claim) no reason not to say that race is also a universal category because it obliterates the difference of sexuality (and other differences), which is, by the same logic, itself a universal category since it obliterates the difference of age (and other differences), which is itselfa universal category because it obliterates the difference of (dis)ability (and other differences), which is itselfa univer- sal category because it obliterates the difference of class (and other differences). In short, the social, in Giroux's pedagogy is a circle of oppressions, none of whose components can explain any structural relations; each simply absorbs the other ("class is actually lived through race," paraphrasing Giroux) and thus points back to itself as a local knowledge ofthe affective, difference, and contingency. Class explains race; it does not absorb it as an experience (see Butler, "Merely"), nor does i t reduce it to the contingencies o f ethnicities (Hall, "New") or urban performativities (Kelley, Yo '). To put it differently, since in this pluralism of oppressions each element cancels out the explanatory capacity of all others, the existing social relations are reaffirmed in a pragmatic balancing of differences. Nothing changes, everything is resignified. The classroom of experience reduces all concepts (which it marks as "grand narratives") to affects ("little stories") and, instead of explaining the social in order to change it, only "interprets" it as a profusion of differences. Teaching becomes an affirmation of the singular-as-is; its lessons "save the honor of the name" (see Lyotard, Postmodern 82). Giroux's program is a mimesis ofthe logic of the ruling ideology: as in all pedagogies of affect, it redescribes the relation of the subject of knowledge with the world but leaves the world itselfintact byreifying the signs of"difference" (see Rorty, Contingency 53, 73). The subject, as I will discuss later in my analysis ofCary Nelson's radical pedagogy, feels differently about itself in a world that remains what it was. Giroux is putting forth a class-cleansing pedagogy: he erases class from teaching in the name ofepistemology ("totalization"). But as I have already argued, epistemology is not an issue for Giroux; it is an alibi for hollowing out from class its economic explanatory power. Epistemology in bourgeois pedagogy is class politics represented as "theory"-whose aim is to tum class into a cultural aleatory experience. In Giroux's phenomenological experientialism, lived experience is an excuse for advancing the cause of capital in a populist logic (respect for the ineluctable "experience" of the student) so that the student, the future worker, is trained as one who understands the world only through the sense-able - his own "unique" experience as black, white, or brown; man or woman; gay or straight - but never as a proletariat: a person who, regardless of race, sexuality, gender, age, or (dis)ability has to sell his or her labor power to capital in order to obtain subsistence wages in exchange. Experience, in Giroux's pedagogy, becomes a self-protecting "inside" that resists world-historical knowledge as an intrusion from "outside"; it thus valorizes ignorance as a mark of the authenticity and sovereignty ofthe subject-as independence and free choice.

#### The discourse link - Race is inherently related to existing material property relationships – they reduce racial oppression to discourse, without connecting it to the larger social structures of capitalism

Young 6 (Robert, Red Critique, Winter/Spring, “Putting Materialism back into Race Theory”, <http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2006/puttingmaterialismbackintoracetheory.htm>)

In Goldberg, the obsession with autonomy engenders a reification of discourse and the political implications of this are quite revealing. For Goldberg, discourse—not class struggle—becomes the motor of history: "it is in virtue of racist discourse and not merely rationalized by it that such forced manipulations of individual subjects and whole populations could have been affected" (95). He continues: "[i]nstruments of exclusion—legal, cultural, political, or economic—are forged by subjects as they mould criteria for establishing racial otherness" (95). Racial alterity makes sense not on its own terms but in relation to "instruments of exclusion". However, to move beyond Goldberg, I suggest that these instruments, in turn, must be related to existing property relationships. In short, the logic of alterity justifies and hence assists in the maintenance of class generated social inequality. The preoccupation with "autonomy" and "racial discourse formation" makes it seem as if social life is a matter of "contingency". This view blocks our understanding of the one constant feature of daily life under capitalism: exploitation. Under capitalism, exploitation is a not a discursive contingency but a structural articulation, and this structure of exploitation underpins (post)modern social life. At the moment then, the discourse of autonomy displaces the structure of exploitation and, in this regard, I believe one can map out the ideological collusion taking place in race theory. As I pointed out earlier, the humanists posit the "uniqueness" of black subjectivity and now we can see the postmodern corollary which posits the "uniqueness" of racial discourse. I refer to these positions as the "pedagogy of autonomy" because both instruct subjects to value the local. In both instances, the discourse of autonomy provides an ideological framework for protecting the "unique" against its conceptual other—knowledge of the social totality. The pedagogues of autonomy assume that the "unique", in its immediacy to the concrete, provides access to the real and therefore grounds knowledge. These (anti-reductionist) pedagogues reduce knowledge to the concrete and, consequently, mystify our understanding of race because they disconnect it from larger social structures like class and ideology.

#### Anti-capitalism struggle is the best means of challenging racism

McLaren and Torres 99 (Peter Mclaren, professor of education at U of California, and Rudolfo Torres, Professor of Planning, Policy, and Design, Chicano/Latino Studies, and Political Science, “Racism and Multicultural Education: Rethinking ‘Race’ and ‘Whiteness’ in Late Capitalism”, Chapter 2 of “Critical Multiculturalism: Rethinking Multicultural and Antiracist Education”, edited by Stephen May, p.69, Questia)

Capitalism in advanced western countries must be dismantled if extra-economic inequalities-such as racism and sexism-are to be challenged successfully. While it is true that people have identities other than class identities that shape their experiences in crucial and important ways, anticapitalist struggle is the best means to inform educators as to how identities can be conceived and rearticulated within the construction of a radical socialist project. As Ellen Wood notes: Capitalism is constituted by class exploitation, but capitalism is more than just a system of class oppression. It is a ruthless totalizing process which shapes our lives in every conceivable aspect, and everywhere, not just in the relative opulence of the capitalist North. Among other things, and even leaving aside the direct power wielded by capitalist wealth both in the economy and in the political sphere, it subjects all social life to the abstract requirements of the market, through the commodification of life in all its aspects, determining the allocation of labour, leisure, resources, patterns of production, consumption and the disposition of time. This makes a mockery of all our aspirations to autonomy, freedom of choice, and democratic self-government. (1995, pp. 262-3) Critical educators need to consider how racisms in their present incarnations developed out of the dominant mode of global production during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries of colonial plantations in the New World with slave labour imported from Africa to produce consumer goods such as, among others, tobacco, sugar, and cotton. How the immigrant working-class has been divided historically along racialized lines is a process that needs to be better understood and more forcefully addressed by multicultural educators. How, for instance, does racism give white workers a particular identity which unites them with white capitalists (Callinicos, 1992)

#### A materialist method is key - illumination of social and political relations through dialetical materialism is key to achieving class consciousness and thus stopping capitalism

Lukacs 1919 (George, Hungarian philosopher, He was the founder of Western Marxism, “What is Orthodox Marxism” http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm)

If the question were really to be formulated in terms of such a crude antithesis it would deserve at best a pitying smile. But in fact it is not (and never has been) quite so straightforward. Let us assume for the sake of argument that recent research had disproved once and for all every one of Marx’s individual theses. Even if this were to be proved, every serious ‘orthodox’ Marxist would still be able to accept all such modern findings without reservation and hence dismiss all of Marx’s theses in toto – without having to renounce his orthodoxy for a single moment. Orthodox Marxism, therefore, does not imply the uncritical acceptance of the results of Marx’s investigations. It is not the ‘belief’ in this or that thesis, nor the exegesis of a ‘sacred’ book. On the contrary, orthodoxy refers exclusively to method. It is the scientific conviction that dialectical materialism is the road to truth and that its methods can be developed, expanded and deepened only along the lines laid down by its founders. It is the conviction, moreover, that all attempts to surpass or ‘improve’ it have led and must lead to over-simplification, triviality and eclecticism. 1 Materialist dialectic is a revolutionary dialectic. This definition is so important and altogether so crucial for an understanding of its nature that if the problem is to be approached in the right way this must be fully grasped before we venture upon a discussion of the dialectical method itself. The issue turns on the question of theory and practice. And this not merely in the sense given it by Marx when he says in his first critique of Hegel that “theory becomes a material force when it grips the masses.” [[1]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm#1) Even more to the point is the need to discover those features and definitions both of the theory and the ways of gripping the masses which convert the theory, the dialectical method, into a vehicle of revolution. We must extract the practical essence of the theory from the method and its relation to its object. If this is not done that ‘gripping the masses’ could well turn out to be a will o’ the wisp. It might turn out that the masses were in the grip of quite different forces, that they were in pursuit of quite different ends. In that event, there would be no necessary connection between the theory and their activity, it would be a form that enables the masses to become conscious of their socially necessary or fortuitous actions, without ensuring a genuine and necessary bond between consciousness and action. In the same essay [[2]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm#2) Marx clearly defined the conditions in which a relation between theory and practice becomes possible. “It is not enough that thought should seek to realise itself; reality must also strive towards thought.” Or, as he expresses it in an earlier work: [[3]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm#3) “It will then be realised that the world has long since possessed something in the form of a dream which it need only take possession of consciously, in order to possess it in reality.” Only when consciousness stands in such a relation to reality can theory and practice be united. But for this to happen the emergence of consciousness must become the decisive step which the historical process must take towards its proper end (an end constituted by the wills of men, but neither dependent on human whim, nor the product of human invention). The historical function of theory is to make this step a practical possibility. Only when a historical situation has arisen in which a class must understand society if it is to assert itself; only when the fact that a class understands itself means that it understands society as a whole and when, in consequence, the class becomes both the subject and the object of knowledge; in short, only when these conditions are all satisfied will the unity of theory and practice, the precondition of the revolutionary function of the theory, become possible. Such a situation has in fact arisen with the entry of the proletariat into history. “When the proletariat proclaims the dissolution of the existing social order,” Marx declares, “it does no more than disclose the secret of its own existence, for it is the effective dissolution of that order.” [[4]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm#4) The links between the theory that affirms this and the revolution are not just arbitrary, nor are they particularly tortuous or open to misunderstanding. On the contrary, the theory is essentially the intellectual expression of the revolutionary process itself. In it every stage of the process becomes fixed so that it may be generalised, communicated, utilised and developed. Because the theory does nothing but arrest and make conscious each necessary step, it becomes at the same time the necessary premise of the following one.