# Wake – Round 1 vs. West Georgia DF (Neg)

## 1NC

### Framework

#### 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:

#### Political judgment and policymaking are not declarations of universal truths but rather partial prescriptions in which we must engage to affirm our own humanity.

Berkowitz 10 [Roger, director, Hannah Arendt Center for Politics and Humanities, “Why We Must Judge,” *Democracy: A Journal of Ideas* 18 (Fall 2010) at http://www.democracyjournal.org/18/6770.php]

We must face our unwillingness to judge. This fear of judgment is all too recognizable—the political thinker Hannah Arendt was writing about it in the middle of the last century. In her essays and books, Arendt gave voice to what she called the “fear of passing judgment, of naming names, and of fixing blame—especially, alas, upon people in power and high position.” Reflecting upon the anger caused by her own judgment of the Judenräte—the Jewish community leaders who cooperated with the Nazis in the hopes of saving themselves, their families, and others—Arendt was struck by the fear and anger that judging others provoked. She worried about the fear of judgment underlying the uproar against Rolf Hochhuth’s play, The Deputy, which accused Pope Pius XII of silence in the face of the Holocaust. And she chafed at the outpouring of angry letters accusing scholar Hans Morgenthau of un-Christian hubris for writing an essay in The New York Times Magazine pointing out that Charles Van Doren was wrong to cheat on the quiz show “Twenty One.” In all of these instances, Arendt was struck by the “huge outcry the moment anyone fixes specific blame on some particular person instead of blaming all deeds or events on historical trends or dialectical movements.” Instead of judging the wrongdoers, the people judged those who had the temerity to judge.¶ At the root of our problem with judgment is the undeniable victory of relativism over truth. Judgment requires, above all, what Kant called disinterestedness and what Arendt called enlarged mentality, seeing the question from another’s point of view. While it is singular, judgment is not mere personal taste or preference. To judge is to speak the truth, a truth that must always appeal to a common sense beyond one’s own prejudices. At a time when tolerance trumps truth, judgment’s claim to the truth leaves it vulnerable to mockery and derision.¶ Our unwillingness to judge is also part and parcel of liberalism itself. There is, as Arendt has written, a great temptation to explain away evil and perversion by means of liberal rationalizations. Liberals are so prone to suspend judgment in the name of tolerance that they are susceptible to a values vacuum. To sympathize with the plight of the poor is unquestionably humane. But well-meaning liberal paternalism that insists the poor be hidden in shelters and offers up compassion in the form of a dehumanizing bureaucracy deprives those we are trying to help of the basic respect of being free and independent persons. To worry about our impact on our planet and expose corporate irresponsibility shows farsightedness. But to hope that politicians will solve the problem while we drive our SUVs, swim in our heated pools, and run our air conditioners reflects a profound unwillingness to judge ourselves and those around us.¶ The rise of social science is yet another ground for our crisis of judgment. The more that social events and personal actions are understood to be calculable, predictable, and manipulable through norms and rules identified by sociologists, economists, and political scientists, the less responsible people are for their actions. To say that someone commits a crime because he grew up poor with alcoholic parents or has a genetic predisposition to violence is to challenge the very assumption of personal responsibility that underlies judgment. If what we do, what we read, and what we buy—who we are, in other words—can be plotted on a bell curve and reduced to “science,” we trade the rarity of action for the normalcy of behavior. And the diminished responsibility of rational actors leads to an unwillingness to judge those who are clearly responsible for what they do.¶ Finally, the retreat from judgment is a corollary of the overwhelming belief in equality that marks the modern era. Judgment, as thinkers like Arendt and Friedrich Nietzsche remind us, presupposes pride, or what once was called the dignity of man. Only one who believes oneself right can judge another; thus judgment presupposes a certain authority and superiority. The judge must possess a feeling of distinction, what Nietzsche called a “pathos of difference,” in order to arrogate to himself or herself the right to judge. Proffering reasons for one’s judgment—the mark of rational judgment in modern times—is a sure sign of weakness, an admission that one suffers from a feeling that he or she lacks the right to judge another. Since Justice Louis Brandeis first introduced social science evidence into legal opinions, judges have sought to buttress their judgments with rationalizations and empirical support intended to lend objective and scientific authority to particular judgments. But only one who is unsure of his or her right to judge feels the need to offer statistics, studies, and rationalizations to justify that judgment. It is precisely this arrogance of the judge that is increasingly absent in our age.¶ From the fact of such a deeply ingrained distrust of judging, Arendt drew an essential lesson: namely, that morality in our times cannot be taken for granted. In the absence of judgment, and amidst doubt about the possibility of justice, she argued that we need to foster, support, and embolden morality.¶ To keep the idea of justice alive does not require curricula in ethics or a return of the catechism. Morality, as Immanuel Kant wrote in his famous footnote responding to Professor Sulzer, cannot be taught through rules in a classroom. Only by example can one be inspired to emulate moral action. Examples, as Kant saw, “are the go-cart of judgment.” Telling someone that it is wrong to torture and even providing rational arguments will rarely sway another. But decisively resisting the desire to employ torture as a means, or courageously saying no to an order to torture, will do more to inculcate a moral duty in others than any amount of ethical education. Similarly, bringing someone who has tortured to judgment will inculcate a common sense of the wrongness of torture more meaningfully than any amount of philosophizing and moralizing.¶ Arendt offered just such an example of judgment at the end of her book Eichmann in Jerusalem, where she argued that Eichmann must die even though he had not broken a specific law. Arendt’s judgment was stark and harsh: “Just as you supported and carried out a policy of not wanting to share the earth with the Jewish people,” she wrote, “we find that no one, that is, no member of the human race, can be expected to want to share the earth with you. This is the reason, and the only reason, you must hang.” Arendt criticized the Israeli court for basing its judgment on ex post facto laws. Eichmann needed to be judged and executed, Arendt writes, not because he was a bad person—after all, she called him a banal bureaucrat—nor because he broke laws, but because justice requires that evil acts be judged and punished. Such an act of judgment assumes the pride of knowing oneself to be right. It rejects Eichmann’s claim that where all are guilty, none are, a rationale rooted in a social scientific worldview. It refuses to say that understanding Eichmann’s normality excuses him. Rather, it announces a truth.¶ The importance of Arendt’s judgment of Eichmann rests on her conviction that such an act was necessary to affirm our common-sense belief in judgment itself. At a time when religion and tradition no longer buttress universal or public claims to truth, acts of judgment claim that we all must agree that this bad thing was wrong and it must be punished. It is in judgment that we singularly and together make sense of what is new, challenging, and horrible in our world.¶

#### We must engage the institutions of the status quo in order to *act* because action occurs in the medium of human plurality made meaningful by its historical embededness in institutions.

Arendt 1958 [Hannah, *The Human Condition*, pp. 182-185]

Action and speech go on between men, as they are directed toward them, and they retain their agent-revealing capacity even if their content is exclusively "objective," concerned with the matters of the world of things in which men move, which physically lies between them and out of which arise their specific, objective, worldly interests. These interests constitute, in the word's most literal significance, something which inter-est, which lies between people and therefore can relate and bind them together. Most action and speech is concerned with this in-between, which varies with each group of people, so that most words and deeds are about some worldly objective reality in addition to being a disclosure of the acting and speaking agent. Since this disclosure of the subject is an integral part of all, even the most "objective" intercourse, the physical, worldy in-between along with its inter- ests is overlaid and, as it were, overgrown with an altogether different in-between which consists of deeds and words and owes its origin exclusively to men's acting and speaking directly to one another. This second, subjective in-between is not tangible, since there are no tangible objects into which it could solidify; the process of acting and speaking can leave behind no such results and end products. But for all its intangibility, this in-between is no less real than the world of things we visibly have in common. We call this reality the "web" of human relationships, indicating by the metaphor its somewhat intangible quality. To be sure, this web is no less bound to the objective world of things than speech is to the existence of a living body, but the relationship is not like that of a facade or, in Marxian terminology, of an essentially superfluous superstructure affixed to the useful structure of the building itself. The basic error of all materialism in politics—and this materialism is not Marxian and not even modern in origin, but as old as our history of political theory8— is to overlook the inevitability with which men disclose themselves as subjects, as distinct and unique persons, even when they wholly concentrate upon reaching an altogether worldly, material object. To dispense with this disclosure, if indeed it could ever be done, would mean to transform men into something they are not; to deny, on the other hand, that this disclosure is real and has consequences of its own is simply unrealistic. The realm of human affairs, strictly speaking, consists of the web of human relationships which exists wherever men live together. The disclosure of the "who" through speech, and the setting of a new beginning through action, always fall into an already existing web where their immediate consequences can be felt. Together they start a new process which eventually emerges as the unique life story of the newcomer, affecting uniquely the life stories of all those with whom he comes into contact. It is because of this already existing web of human relationships, with its innumerable, conflicting wills and intentions, that action almost never achieves its purpose; but it is also because of this medium, in which action alone is real, that it "produces" stories with or without intention as naturally as fabrication produces tangible things. These stories may then be recorded in documents and monuments, they may be visible in use objects or art works, they may be told and retold and worked into all kinds of material. They themselves, in their living reality, are of an altogether different nature than these reifications. They tell us more about their subjects, the "hero" in the center of each story, than any product of human hands ever tells us about the master who produced it, and yet they are not products, properly speaking. Although everybody started his life by inserting himself into the human world through action and speech, nobody is the author or producer of his own life story. In other words, the stories, the results of action and speech, reveal an agent, but this agent is not an author or producer. Somebody began it and is its subject in the twofold sense of the word, namely, its actor and sufferer, but nobody is its author.

### Cap K

#### 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. 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.

#### 4. Class divisions are the root of all other oppressions

Kovel 2 (Alger Hiss Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, awarded Fellowship at the John Guggenheim Foundation, Joel, The Enemy of Nature, pages 123-124)

If, however, we ask the question of efficacy, that is, which split sets the others into motion, then priority would have to be given to class, for the plain reason that class relations entail the state as an instrument of enforce­ment and control, and it is the state that shapes and organizes the splits that appear in human ecosystems. Thus class is both logically and historically distinct from other forms of exclusion (hence we should not talk of 'classism' to go along with 'sexism' and 'racism,' and `species-ism'). This is, first of all, because class is an essentially man-made category, without root in even a mystified biology. We cannot imagine a human world without gender dis­tinctions – although we can imagine a world without domination by gender. But a world without class is eminently imaginable – indeed, such was the human world for the great majority of our species' time on earth, during all of which considerable fuss was made over gender. Historically, the difference arises because 'class' signifies one side of a larger figure that includes a state apparatus whose conquests and regulations create races and shape gender relations. Thus there will be no true resolution of racism so long as class society stands, inasmuch as a racially oppressed society implies the activities of a class-defending state.'° Nor can gender inequality be enacted away so long as class society, with its state, demands the super-exploitation of woman's labour. Class society continually generates gender, racial, ethnic oppressions and the like, which take on a life of their own, as well as profoundly affecting the concrete relations of class itself. It follows that class politics must be fought out in terms of all the active forms of social splitting. It is the management of these divisions that keeps state society functional. Thus though each person in a class society is reduced from what s/he can become, the varied reductions can be combined into the great stratified regimes of history — this one becoming a fierce warrior, that one a routine-loving clerk, another a submissive seamstress, and so on, until we reach today's personi­fications of capital and captains of industry. Yet no matter how functional a class society, the profundity of its ecological violence ensures a basic antagonism which drives history onward. History is the history of class society — because no matter how modified, so powerful a schism is bound to work itself through to the surface, provoke resistance (`class struggle'), and lead to the succession of powers. The relation of class can be mystified without end — only consider the extent to which religion exists for just this purpose, or watch a show glorifying the police on television — yet so long as we have any respect for human nature, we must recognize that so funda­mental an antagonism as would steal the vital force of one person for the enrichment of another cannot be conjured away.

#### 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.

#### 6. Socialism wrests decision making power from the elites, preventing the destructive use of nuclear power against the working class – it also eliminates the continuous drive for growth which has made nuclear power necessary in the first place

Socialist Labor Party of America 79 (“The Socialist Alternative to Nuclear Catastrophe” http://www.slp.org/res\_state\_htm/nuc\_catas79.html)

While the Three Mile Island accident dramatically reconfirms that conclusion, the conflict between the commercial use of nuclear technology and the well-being of the American people has for years been obvious to anyone willing to review the facts. Scores of scientific studies and a host of commercial accidents had long ago obviated any need to doubt the dangers posed by nuclear plants. The capitalist class would like workers to believe that the Three Mile Island accident will result in stiffer regulations and standards that will render such plants safe, but what the crippled Pennsylvania reactor really attests to is the wanton irresponsibility of those who own and control nuclear technology. Even if nuclear plant operations could somehow be rendered fail-safe, the nuclear industry has found no solution to the stockpiles of nuclear waste that have already mortgaged the health and safety of generations to come.¶ Business as Usual¶ In fact, while calling for additional federal regulations and increased government policing of nuclear power plants, capitalist politicians and bureaucrats have already demonstrated that even a near-catastrophe like the one that occurred near Harrisburg will have no substantive impact on the manner in which the nuclear industry does business. Dozens of nuclear plants, a number of them virtual “clones” of the Three Mile Island installation, continue to operate in callous disregard for the public safety. And the Carter administration has already announced that it will push ahead with legislation to streamline the procedure to license new nuclear facilities.¶ The recent nuclear accident again supports the Socialist Labor Party’s position that nothing less than the abolition of the profit system and the socialist reconstruction of society will make it possible for the American people to restore and maintain a safe and healthful environment. Only with the elimination of private ownership in the means of production and the establishment of a socialist industrial democracy will the working-class majority of Americans be able to harness technology while giving due consideration to its health, safety and environmental implications.¶ The call for a socialist solution to the nuclear energy problem has nothing in common with calls for the nationalization of the nuclear industry. Such a step would neither alter the profit motivations which dictate how nuclear technology is implemented nor take control of such technology out of the hands of a small minority and place it under the collective control of the working class. Indeed, the fact that the current nuclear peril has been overseen by government agencies for years provides ample proof that a resolution of the problem is not to be found in government ownership by the capitalist state.¶ Socialist Solution¶ In a socialist society, the government would consist of the industrial organization of the working class at the workplace, where workers would democratically make the decisions on how the resources available to society are to be used, what energy sources are to be developed, what goods are to be produced, etc. Workers would collectively hold full decision-making power over the use of all technology, nuclear or otherwise. With the abolition of the profit motive and the transformation of the means of production from private into social property, such decisions would be made not by a minority to serve its own vested interests, but by the working-class majority, which could rationally assess the overall impact any decision would have on the general welfare.¶ Moreover, putting the nation on a socialist foundation based on production for use would free the economy of the capitalist economic imperatives that have fueled the drive toward nuclear energy. A socialist economy would be characterized by the planning and rational allocation of resources that are rendered impossible by the profit motive. A socialist society would reduce the need for all sources of energy by eliminating the enormous waste that takes place today under capitalism. Planned obsolescence, shoddy products and other manifestations of the waste that permeate capitalist production would be eliminated. Mass transit systems would be developed. And a socialist society would accelerate the development of safe, nonpolluting, renewable sources of energy. These efforts—coupled with the dismantling of U.S. imperialism’s massive nuclear arsenal—would rapidly eliminate the social peril nuclear energy now poses.¶ Workers today continue to live under the shadow of nuclear disaster, but in a socialist society workers could enjoy a material abundance without in any way compromising their health and safety. Outrages like the one that occurred near Harrisburg continue to expose the antisocial nature of the capitalist system for all workers to see. And as the manifold social problems of capitalism increasingly threaten the lives and well-being of workers, it becomes more and more imperative that they recognize the need to organize politically and economically to take control of the economy, abolish class-divided capitalism and administer production through their own democratic bodies.

### Lat Crit K

#### 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.

### Case

#### The aff’s Politics of Personal Identity forecloses any possibility real social change. If you are concerned with real bodies in pain and suffering, effective advocacy demands that you move beyond yourself to understand the structures in society that make these impacts inevitable. Vote negative to reject this myopic brand of politics.

**Minow 97** [Martha, Not Only For Myself: Identity, Politics, and the Law, Professor of Law @ Harvard, p. 56-57]

Identity politics tends to locate the problem in the identity group rather than the social relations that produce identity groupings.235 **Personal testimony about oppression risks replacing analysis of social structures that produce and maintain it**.236 **Personal testimony is crucial to articulating and maintaining memories, but incapable of providing either analysis of the past or constructive programs for the future. Cornel West observes: "we confine discussions about race in America to the 'problems' black people pose for whites rather than consider what this way of viewing black people reveals about us as a nation."**237 **Serious discussion of race in America, he argues, "must begin not with the problems of black people but with the flaws in American society—flaws rooted in historic inequalities and longstanding cultural stereotypes."**238 Identity politics is likely to reinforce white people's conception of blacks as "them" rather than bringing home people's mutual dependence and relationships. Identity politics tends to produce not only defensiveness among white men, but also makes it easier for white men to abandon and even blame people of color and women of all sorts for their circumstances. More basically, identity politics seems to breed more identity politics. Judith **Butler put the limitations of identity politics bluntly: "You can articulate your identity all you want; you need the damn resources in order to respond to the concrete problems of bodies in pain."**241 **To get the resources, you need to work with others; to care about other bodies in pain, you need to move beyond your own circumstances.** Racial patterns of inequality persist and expand.242 Yet, there remain twice as many whites as blacks below the poverty line.243 **Something more than identity politics is needed to get a grip on these developments and to engage in resistance to them.**244 A politics not of identities but of envisioned alternatives could bridge identity cleavages without demanding that people dissolve their differences in a pot of assimilation that does not absorb all. I do not want to understate the positive aspects of identity politics: valuable conceptions and occasions for being for oneself and forging solidarity with others based on a perception of a shared trait; important challenges to exclusionary practices; and effective questions about exclusionary practices that claim to be inclusive, such as colorblind policies that nonetheless produce virtually all-white beneficiaries. Identity politics also disturbs the repression of historic and continuing group-based injuries. Yet, ironically, **identity politics responds to group-based exclusions by reiterating the very same group boundaries. The problem is not only that responses to oppression reiterate the oppressive strategy of treating identity as fixed. The potentially multiple, fluid qualities of any person's identity seem to evaporate in the assertion of a single trait. Considerable power must be marshalled to accomplish this disappearing act, given the complexity of anyone's identity. And this magical result does not, at the same time, produce purposes or causes that effectively mobilize people against oppression.**

#### Local struggle is precisely the wrong place to begin. The only way to establish affective ties to one another is through the political. To do otherwise allows the Right to marginalize the struggle altogether.

Grossberg, Professor of Communication Studies and Cultural Studies, 1992

[Lawrence, We gotta get out of this place, p. 365-366]

Identity politics is an extension of feminists' argument that the personal (i.e., experience, determined by social difference) is political. But it ignores the fact that "the political cannot be reduced to the personal."' It assumes that politics is determined by identity and consequently, ignores the most obvious lesson of contemporary political history: the politics of any social position is not guaranteed in advance, even if it appears to be stitched tightly in place. There is no necessary reason why anyone inhabiting a particular experiential field or located in a particular social position has to adhere to particular political agendas and interests. The illusion can be maintained only by assuming that people who do not have the "right" politics must be suffering from false consciousness and they have yet to authentically experience their own lives. It is too easy to assume that abortion is "a woman's issue" and, further, that a woman who is against abortion is acting against her own experience and interests. More importantly, this often leads people to miss broader political possibilities (e.g., that Rust v. Sullivan limits free speech in any federally funded institution and overrides professional codes of responsibility and significantly strengthens both state courts and the Executive Branch). As June Jordan puts it, “People have to begin to understand that just because somebody is a woman or somebody is black does not mean that he or she and I should have the same politics. We should try to measure each on the basis of what we do for each other rather than on the basis of who we are.” Political struggle is too easily replaced by the ongoing analysis of one's own oppression and experience or, only slightly better, by a politics in which the only site of struggle is the local constitution of one's experience within a structure of difference. While the personal is most certainly political, it is often impossible to reach it other than through indirection, through struggles over and within the public sphere. As a political practice, identity politics has (unintentionally) played into efforts by the Right to marginalize many important struggles over both civil liberties and civil rights as "special interests."

#### Their politics is bad because it reduces the struggle to a language contest in an academic forum – ONLY by engaging democracy can we extend beyond the classroom and into areas where we can introduce real change

Bush 11 [Associate Professor and Chair, Anthropology & Sociology @ Adelphi University, Melanie, Everyday Forms of Whiteness: Understanding Race in a “Post-Racial” World, p. 235]

This call, for deepening the curricular emphasis on diversity and race within an economic framework, differs from most of the scholarship that focuses on politics, culture, or identity. More emphasis is needed on developing students' understanding of the nature of society from an economic perspective, which has often been marginalized within the social sciences, as group experiences are often analyzed from the perspective of a collection of individuals rather than as part of a structure. A related phenomenon is that the study of economics often falls under the division of business rather than that of social science, creating a false and problematic separation. "**If multiculturalism is not going to take seriously the link between culture and power, progressive educators will have to rethink collectively what it means to** link the struggle for change within the university to struggles for change in the broader society" (Giroux 1999). **This suggests developing a pedagogy that promotes a social vocabulary of cultural difference that links strategies of understanding to strategies of engagement, that** recognizes the limits of the university as a site for social engagement **and** refuses to reduce politics to matters of language and meaning **that erase broader issues of systemic political power, institutional control, economic ownership and the distribution of cultural and intellectual resources in a wide variety of public spaces**. (Giroux 1999)

#### 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**.

#### Refusing to engage in public policy debates means they conflate racial prejudice with racism – this makes racism inevitable and unsolvable

Dr. Karenga, one of the scholars who pressed for Black studies in the late 60's and early 70s, founder of Kwanzaa, and currently professor and chair of the Black studies department at California State University-Long Beach, 1999

[Dr. Maulana, “Whiteness Studies: Deceptive or Welcome Discourse?,” Black Issues in Higher Education, May 13, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m0DXK/is\_6\_16/ai\_55618721/]

**White studies can also begin to cultivate misunderstanding, as did early studies on racial prejudice, by** confusing or conflating racial prejudice with racism. For **racial prejudice is simply an attitude, hostility, and hatred of the other** based on assumptions about the biological and its effect on the social and cultural. **But racism is the practice of turning that hatred and hostility** into public policy. **Racism expresses itself in three basic ways: as imposition** -- an act of force and violence; **as ideology** -- pseudo-scientific, religious, biological, and cultural absurdities about the inferiority of the other in order to justify domination; **and as institutional arrangement the establishment of** structures and processes **to insure and perpetuate the domination**.

**If Whiteness studies focuses** on these factors, it reaffirms and reinforces Black studies initiatives and the initiatives of other ethnic studies. If it doesn't and focuses on Whites' invention of themselves, **on reaffirmations that biologically we are similar**, and that some Whites were once treated like Blacks, etc., then **it** brings nothing new to the discussion and **can** quite possibly **divert us from focus on the fact of White domination and the policy initiatives and struggles necessary to end it**.

## 2NC

### Cap

### Nuclear Power

#### Race has nothing to do with energy inequality; rather, income is correlated with living in environmentally damaged areas

Downey 5 (Liam, University of Colorado Faculty Associate in Population Program and CU Population Center “The Unintended Significance of Race: Environmental Racial Inequality in Detroit,” Social Forces, 83, 3, 8/1/12, 971-972) CMAP

For example, several environmental inequality studies have found environmental hazards to be distributed equitably according to race in areas where they are distributed inequitably according to income, despite the fact that minorities generally earn significantly less than whites (Anderton et al. 1994a; Oakes, Anderton, and Anderson 1996; Yandle and Burton 1996). But if income is negatively associated with environmental hazard presence and minorities earn less than whites, then minority presence should be positively associated with hazard presence. That this is not always the case suggests that racial status sometimes decreases minority representation in environmentally hazardous neighborhoods below what we would expect based on income alone. This raises interesting and important theoretical questions. Are there situations in which racial status separates minorities from socially undesirable goods such as pollution? More specifically, can racism in one institutional arena (for example, the housing market) weaken racial inequality in another arena (the environment)?¶ In order to answer these questions, I use 1970, 1980, and 1990 data to track the flow of social groups and polluting manufacturing facilities through the Detroit metropolitan area, a region where environmental racial inequality is relatively weak despite the fact that black/white income inequality and income-based environmental inequality are relatively strong. I use census and manufacturing facility data to test four models of environmental inequality that make predictions about the determinants of manufacturing facility siting decisions and the impact that manufacturing facility presence has on neighborhood demographics. Taken collectively, the models ask whether the distribution of blacks and whites around polluting manufacturing facilities is the result of black/white income inequality, racist siting practices, or the biased operation of the housing market.¶ As we shall see, the distribution of blacks and whites around Detroit's polluting manufacturing facilities is not the result of black/white income inequality or racist siting practices. Instead, it is largely the product of residential segregation which, paradoxically, has reduced black proximity to manufacturing facility pollution. Thus, it turns out that racial status and racism play an important role in shaping environmental inequality in the Detroit metropolitan area, but they operate indirectly through the housing market, and their effect has been to separate blacks from manufacturing facility pollution. [End Page 972]

#### Nuclear power plants sited according to income in Japan (Don’t have full text)

Sunagawa 12 (Mari, sociology student Nuclear Power Plants and Inequality in Japan, Ritsumeikan University, in Kyoto, Japan, http://japansociology.com/2012/07/03/nuclear-power-plants-and-inequality-in-japan/)

The accident of nuclear power plants in Fukushima occurred in 2011. The radioactivity spread

AND

social movement in order to decrease the gap among the areas in Japan.

#### Nuclear power in Japan is sited in poor areas (Don’t have full text)

Nelson 12 (Craig, doctoral candidate in history at OSU, http://ehistory.osu.edu/osu/origins/article.cfm?articleid=57)

The nuclear power protest movement started to come into its own in the 1970s,

AND

fishing town lifestyle. Such concerns were mostly local in nature, however.

### A2: Perm Do Both (ID Affs)

#### Their single-issue resistance provides a route for capitalism to co-opt their resistance – labor is the only issue that cannot be integrated and destroyed by capital

Meszaros 95 [Istavan, Prof. Emeritus at Sussex, Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition] p. 40

To aggravate the situation, everything is further complicated by the fact that it is not feasible to find partial solutions to the problems that must be faced. Thus, no ‘single issue’ can be realistically considered a ‘single issue.’ If nothing else, this circumstance has been forcefully highlighted by the disconcerting marginalization of the Green movement on the success of which so much hope has been placed in recent times, even among former socialists. In the past up to a few decades ago it was possible to squeeze out of capital what appeared to be significant concessions—such as relative gains for the socialist movement (which later turned out to be reversible both as legislative measures for working class action and as gradually improving standard of living), obtained through the defensive organizations of labour: its trades unions and parliamentary parties. These gains could be conceded by capital so long as they could be assimilated and integrated by the system as a whole and turned to its productive advantage in the course of its self-expansion. Today, by contrast, confronting even partial issues with any hope of success implies the necessity of challenging the capital system as such. For in our own historical epoch, when productive self-expansion is no longer a readily available way out of the accumulating difficulties and contradictions (hence the purely wishful thinking of getting rid of the black hope of indebtedness by ‘growing out of it’), the global capital system of necessity frustrates all attempts at interfering even to a minimal extent with its structural parameters. In this respect the obstacles to be overcome are actually shared by labour—that is, labour as the radical alternative to capital’s social metabolic order—and the ‘single issue’ movements. For the historic failure of social democracy clearly underlined that only integrable demands can gain legitimacy under the rule of capital. Environmentalism by its very nature—just like the great historic cause of women’s liberation—is non-integrable. Consequently no such cause will for the capital system conveniently fade way, irrespective of how many setbacks and defeats the politically organized forms of ‘single issue’ movements might have to suffer in the foreseeable future. However, historically/epochally defined non-integrability, no matter how important for the future, cannot guarantee success on its own. Switching the allegiance of disappointed socialists from the working class to so-called ‘new social movements’ (praised now in opposition to, and by discarding altogether the emancipatory potential of, labour) must be considered, therefore, far too premature and naive. Single issue movements, even if they fight for non-integrable causes, can be picked off and marginalized one by one, because they cannot lay claim to representing a coherent and comprehensive alternative to the given order as a mode of social metabolic control and system of societal reproduction. This is what makes focusing on the socialist emancipatory potential of labour more important today than ever before. For labour is not only non-integrable (in contrast to some historically specific political manifestations of labour, like reformist social democracy, which may be rightly characterized as integrable and indeed in the last few decades also completely integrated), but — precisely as the only feasible structural alternative to capital — can provide the comprehensive strategic framework within which all ‘single issue’ emancipatory movements can successfully make their common cause for the survival of humanity.

#### The permutation is severance – it severs out of the methodology of capitalism rooted in the 1AC. This a voting issue because it creates a moving target that steals neg ground a makes it impossible to debate.

#### You cannot permute a method – it strips out all of the conceptual theory that allows us both understand the world and to create a praxis to end oppression

Tumino 1 [Stephen, Prof English at Pitt, ““What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More than Ever”, Red Critique, p. online]

Orthodox Marxism has become a test-case of the "radical" today. Yet, what passes for orthodoxy on the left—whether like Smith and Zizek they claim to support it, or, like Butler and Rorty they want to "achieve our country" by excluding it from "U.S. Intellectual life" ("On Left Conservatism"), is a parody of orthodoxy which hybridizes its central concepts and renders them into flexodox simulations. Yet, even in its very textuality, however, the orthodox is a resistance to the flexodox. Contrary to the common-sensical view of "orthodox" as "traditional" or "conformist" "opinions," is its other meaning: ortho-doxy not as flexodox "hybridity," but as "original" "ideas." "Original," not in the sense of epistemic "event," "authorial" originality and so forth, but, as in chemistry, in its opposition to "para," "meta," "post" and other ludic hybridities: thus "ortho" as resistance to the annotations that mystify the original ideas of Marxism and hybridize it for the "special interests" of various groups. The "original" ideas of Marxism are inseparable from their effect as "demystification" of ideology—for example the deployment of "class" that allows a demystification of daily life from the haze of consumption. Class is thus an "original idea" of Marxism in the sense that it cuts through the hype of cultural agency under capitalism and reveals how culture and consumption are tied to labor, the everyday determined by the workday: how the amount of time workers spend engaging in surplus-labor determines the amount of time they get for reproducing and cultivating their needs. Without changing this division of labor social change is impossible. Orthodoxy is a rejection of the ideological annotations: hence, on the one hand, the resistance to orthodoxy as "rigid" and "dogmatic" "determinism," and, on the other, its hybridization by the flexodox as the result of which it has become almost impossible today to read the original ideas of Marxism, such as "exploitation"; "surplus-value"; "class"; "class antagonism"; "class struggle"; "revolution"; "science" (i.e., objective knowledge); "ideology" (as "false consciousness"). Yet, it is these ideas alone that clarify the elemental truths through which theory ceases to be a gray activism of tropes, desire and affect, and becomes, instead, a red, revolutionary guide to praxis for a new society freed from exploitation and injustice. Marx's original scientific discovery was his labor theory of value. Marx's labor theory of value is an elemental truth of Orthodox Marxism that is rejected by the flexodox left as the central dogmatism of a "totalitarian" Marxism. It is only Marx's labor theory of value, however, that exposes the mystification of the wages system that disguises exploitation as a "fair exchange" between capital and labor and reveals the truth about this relation as one of exploitation. Only Orthodox Marxism explains how what the workers sell to the capitalist is not labor, a commodity like any other whose price is determined by fluctuations in supply and demand, but their labor-power—their ability to labor in a system which has systematically "freed" them from the means of production so they are forced to work or starve—whose value is determined by the amount of time socially necessary to reproduce it daily. The value of labor-power is equivalent to the value of wages workers consume daily in the form of commodities that keep them alive to be exploited tomorrow. Given the technical composition of production today this amount of time is a slight fraction of the workday the majority of which workers spend producing surplus-value over and above their needs. The surplus-value is what is pocketed by the capitalists in the form of profit when the commodities are sold. Class is the antagonistic division thus established between the exploited and their exploiters. Without Marx's labor theory of value one could only contest the after effects of this outright theft of social labor-power rather than its cause lying in the private ownership of production. The flexodox rejection of the labor theory of value as the "dogmatic" core of a totalitarian Marxism therefore is a not so subtle rejection of the principled defense of the (scientific) knowledge workers need for their emancipation from exploitation because only the labor theory of value exposes the opportunism of knowledges (ideology) that occult this exploitation. Without the labor theory of value socialism would only be a moral dogma that appeals to the sentiments of "fairness" and "equality" for a "just" distribution of the social wealth that does the work of capital by naturalizing the exploitation of labor under capitalism giving it an acceptable "human face."

#### Ethics DA – We have ethical obligation to repudiate capitalism – this means any risk a link is a reason to reject the permutation

Marsh 95 (James, Professor of Philosophy at Fordham University, “Critique, Action, Liberation” p. 334-335)

An example from the sphere of personal morality should make the difference clear. When a friend, relative, teacher, or minister counsels an alcoholic to confront her habit, she is not making a prediction. Indeed it may seem unlikely, given this particular person’s past history, that she will lick her habit. Nonetheless, the moral obligation to get over her habit remains. Similarly, an obligation exists to get over our capitalism as a social equivalent of drunkenness. If the argument of this chapter is correct, we cannot renounce such an attempt at transcendence without giving up on the ethical project or curtailing that project by confining it to the sphere of intimate, interpersonal relations**.** I am a good father or husband or lover in my private life, but i remain exploitative, cruel, and inhumane in my public, capitalistic life. Such ethical renunciation or curtailment is the death or mutilation of the human; denial of utopia is a living death. Ideologies of scientific elitism, therefore, as they function in capitalist society are correct if there is no such thing as ethical, constitutive reason operating in community**.** If such constitutive reason is possible and actual in human beings as human in community, then scientific elitism is false. Men and women acting democratically and participatively do have a capacity to understand themselves and their lives in a way that is cogent and in touch with reality. Indeed, many of the popular movements in Europe, England, and the United States in the last twenty years such as feminism, environmentalism, civil rights, and antiwar movements, often acting against the advice or opinion of experts have shown themselves to be right and effective. In the Vietnam War, for example, millions of people in the united states taking to the streets in protest proved the “best and the brightest” in the white house, pentagon, and state department wrong. The “best and the brightest” according to the standards of scientific elitism proved to be deluded. The presence of an ethical, political rationality in all of us as human invalidates scientific elitism at its core. As I am arguing it here, a fundamental link exists among dialectical phenomenology, ethical, constitutive rationality, and democracy. Philosophy and ethics, properly understood, are antielitist. To think in a utopian manner, then, about community and socialism is to free ourselves from the excessive hold that science and technology exert over our minds and imaginations. We begin to see that science and technology and expertise, even though they are legitimate within their proper domains, do not exhaust or monopolize the definition of reason and other forms of reason and knowledge that are more informative, profound, and fundamental, indeed, compared to certain expressions of art or ethics or philosophy or religion, science and technology are relatively superficial**.** What revelatory power does a scientific equation have compared to Hamlet’s “to be or not to be” speech? What does an empirical of human populations show me about human life compared to the insight of Marx’s capital? What can a factual study of war show about its horrors compared to Picasso’s Guernica? To the extend, therefore, that science and technology dominate in the twentieth century as not only the highest forms of reason by the only forms of reason, they shove other, more profound, more reflective, more fundamental forms of reason to the side and twentieth-century industrial society emerges as an inverted, topsy-turvy, absurd world. What seems normal, factural, rational, and sane in such a world is in fact abnormal, apparent, irrational, and absurd. We begin to suspect and see that science and technology appear as the highest and only forms of reason because capitalism has appropriated science and technology for its own ends as productive force and ideology. In science and technology capitalism has found the forms of rationality most appropriate for itself, perfectly manifesting it, mirroring it, and justifying it. In such an absurd, inverted topsy-turvy world, fidelity to the life of reason demands critique, resistance, and revolutionary transcendence. One has to pierce the veil of such a world, see through it as absurd rather than accepting it as normal and sane. The prevailing rationality is profoundly irrational.

### 2NC Alt Solves Racism

#### 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.

## 1NR

### Lat Crit K

### Overview

#### The K outweighs and turns case –

#### Our rejection alone 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**.

#### 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.**

#### B. 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.

#### C. 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**.

### A2: We’re a Good Starting Point

#### This is the exact link that we talk about. Attempting to define experience and identity by either whiteness or blackness erases the passing portion of people’s identity. They have to be one or the other in order to be relevant.

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**.

#### Their rejection of sovereignty is another link – there are groups that strive for inclusion within the state. Their blanket criticism of the state erases their identity.

Perea, Cone, Wagner, Nugent, Johnson, Hazouri & Roth Professor of Law, University of Florida Levin College of Law, 2010

[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, http://scs.student.virginia.edu/vjspl/18.2/Perea.pdf]

**There are important reasons to recognize the Chicano, American-Indian, and Native Hawaiian struggles for civil rights**. With respect to the Chicano and American-Indian struggles, it is important to counter the belief, demonstrably untrue, that groups other than African Americans are latecomers to civil rights struggle. To the extent that the legitimacy of civil rights claims rests on a history of struggle—and the African-American Civil Rights Movement suggests that this is true to a large extent—then **the legitimacy of Latino and American-Indian claims for civil rights depends on acknowledgement and recognition of their histories of struggle**.54 It is also important to recognize that **the substantive content of civil rights for groups other than African Americans may be different** than the civil rights demanded by African Americans. To illustrate, **the African-American struggle has focused on equality and full inclusion** in American society. Equality and inclusion are remedies for centuries of servitude and forced exclusion. **American-Indian and Native Hawaiian struggles for civil rights, on the other hand, focus on the attainment and enhancement of sovereignty. Greater sovereignty** for American Indians and Native Hawaiians **is the remedy for the denial of sovereign status** historically characteristic of relations between the federal and state governments and Indian nations. Civil rights in the form of enhanced sovereignty for indigenous peoples, although different than the civil rights sought by African Americans, remain civil rights. Civil rights are, in important part, remedies for particular forms of oppression experienced by some peoples. **As advocates for civil and human rights generally, we do not want to fail to recognize a struggle for civil rights merely because it differs from the African-American struggle**.

#### Black/White conceptions erase Arab Americans

Chen, et al., Department of Educational Psychology, University of Texas, 2006

[Grace, Exploring Asian American Racial Identity, Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, Vol. 12, No. 3, p. 461]

**The history of race relations in the U.S. reveals that racial minorities have been subjected to widespread oppression based on the color of their skin** (Omi & Winant, 1994; Takaki, 1993). Unfortunately, **a by-product of the Black/White binary model of race relations is that non-Black racialized groups (e.g., Latinas/os, Arab Americans,** Asian Americans, and Native Americans) **have been largely understudied in psychological research on race and racial identity**. A starting point of our study is that for Asian Americans, in particular, a clear distinction must be made between the constructs of racial identity and ethnic/cultural identity, even as we recognize the overlap and interplay between the two (Helms & Richardson, 1997).

#### They sanction Muslim Terrorist representations

Gotanda 11 [professor of law at Western State University College of Law. Coeditor of Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement, he has written on racial theory, constitutional colorblindness, and Asian American jurisprudence, 2011

[Neil, The Racialization of Islam in American Law, The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 637, September, p. 184]

After 9/11, the “Muslim terrorist” trope altered the American understanding of Islam. This article argues that **the Muslim terrorist in our popular culture should not be seen as new but within an established tradition of racializing Asian Americans**. **The article employs three dimensions of racialization: raced body, racial category, and ascribed subordination. The raced body is the “brown” body of immigrants and descendants of immigrants from North Africa, the Middle East, and Central and Southern Asia. “Muslim” as a racial category has acquired meaning beyond religion and now also describes a racial category: those whose ancestry traces to countries where Islam is significant. Linked to that category are the stereotypes of “terrorist,” “spy,” or “saboteur”—understandings within the tradition of characterizing Asian Americans as permanent, unassimilable foreigners. Inscribing the linked racial category and ascribed subordination of permanent foreignness upon the “brown” raced body is the racialization of Muslims into Muslim terrorists**.

#### Our goal should be to understand all facets of racism – the aff’s exclusive focus on Blacks makes that impossible

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. 1254-1255]

**One could object** to my conclusions **on the grounds that White racism against Blacks has operated for a much longer time than racism against Latinos/as or Asians, and therefore the former problem needs to be studied and remedied first**. English enslavement of Blacks can be traced to the early 1600s, well before the nationhood of the United States. n207 Encounters between Anglo and Mexican people did not begin on a large scale until the 1830s, as Whites moved west into Texas and other parts of the Southwest that, at the time, were parts of Mexico. n208 To a large extent, the Black/White binary paradigm of race has developed precisely because of the historical priority in time of White racism against Blacks and because of the nature of the exploitation that slavery caused. **The question is whether the earlier deployment of White racism against Blacks in the United States justifies the binary approach in race scholarship and thinking today**. **I cannot see scholarly efforts to understand and remedy White racism in all its forms as a "zero-sum game," in which efforts to understand other forms of White racism somehow take away from efforts to understand and remedy White racism against Blacks.** **My goal** is not to take away anything from the study of White racism against Blacks. Rather, it **is to identify** some **limitations of this study** and to add to these studies the study of White racism against other racialized American groups. **Stated simply, we must study and understand White racism in all its forms**. Indeed, here lie some of the possibilities for coalition and for solving some of the problems that resist solution under our current scholarship. n209