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#### Zapatista intellectual politics enables a politics of fugitivity which enables the marginalized to steal from the academy as a strategy for survival. This is the best method for creating revolutionary politics—vote aff to bring debate into the undercommons.

Stevphen Shukaitis, Lecturer in Work & Organization @ Essex University, 2009, “Infrapolitics & the Nomadic Educational Machine,” http://beneaththeu.org/infrapolitics\_and\_the\_nomadic.pdf

Anarchism has an ambivalent relationship to the academy.(1) This is, when one takes a second to reflect, not so surprising. How can one maintain any sense of ethical commitment to non-hierarchal, non- exploitative relationships in a space that operates against many of these political ideals? And how to do so without creating a space or knowledge that can be turned against these political goals themselves? As Marc Bousquet and Tiziana Terranova remind us,(2) the institutional setting of the university is not a location outside the workings of the economy (i.e., it is not a bubble nor an ivory tower), but is very much a part of it, existing within the social factory and producing multifarious forms of value creation and the socialization of labor (the development of ?human capital? and the ability to brandish forth credentials to obtain employment, practices of knowledge, information, and organization that are used throughout the entire social field).(3) This is the case, broadly speaking, both for the classical university, which played an important role in the process of state building and the creation of national culture, and for the neoliberal university, which is more geared to the development of new forms innovation and creativity. That is to say, of course, innovation and creativity understood primarily as those forms that can be translated into new intellectual property rights, patents, and commodifiable forms of knowledge and skills. Thus, there is no ?golden age? of the university that one can refer to or attempt to go back to; it is not a ?university in ruins? that can be rebuilt to return to its former glory precisely because it is a space that has always played a role in creating and maintaining questionable forms of power.(4) Anarchism, except for perhaps a few strains of individualist orientations, cannot find a home in such a space without betraying itself. But the realization that anarchism can never really be of the university does not preclude finding ways to be in the university and to utilize its space, resources, skills, and knowledges as part of articulating and elaborating a larger political project. As Noam Chomsky argues, ?It would be criminal to overlook the serious flaws and inadequacies in our institutions, or to fail to utilize the substantial degree of freedom that most of us enjoy, within the framework of these flawed institutions, to modify or even replace them by a better social order. (5) While the extent of this ?substantial degree of freedom? might very be debatable within the current political climate of the university and more generally, the point nevertheless remains: that one can find ways to use the institutional space without being of the institution, without taking on the institution?s goals as one?s own. It is this dynamic of being within but not of an institutional space, to not institute itself as the hegemonic or representative form, that characterizes the workings of the nomadic educational machine.(6) It is an exodus that does not need to leave in order to find a line of flight. This essay argues against the creation of a distinct area of anarchist studies within the academy in favor of an approach to education based on creating undercommons and enclaves within multiple disciplines and spaces. In other words, to disavow anarchism as object of anarchist studies in favor of a politics of knowledge constantly elaborated within a terrain of struggle. The impossibility of anarchism qua ?Anarchist Studies? proper, far from closing the question of the politics of knowledge from an anarchist perspective, opens the matter precisely from the perspective that more often than not this occurs in the infrapolitical space of what James Scott and Robin D.G. Kelley call the ?hidden transcript of resistance,? the space of minor knowledges and experiences that do not seek to become a major or representative form, instead forming tools from discarded refuse and remains. If there is one thing that can be gleaned from the history of autonomist political thought, it is that the social energies of insurgency and resistance to capitalism, when turned against themselves and re-incorporated into the workings of state and capital, determine the course of capitalist development. That is to say that capitalism develops not according to its own internal structural logic, but according to how it manages to deal with and utilize the social energies of its attempted negation. Similarly, if one heeds the recent analysis that many people, drawing from this tradition, have made of the university (the edu-factory project being perhaps the best example of this (7)), one can see how the university has come to play an increasingly important role in the social field as a space for economic production and struggle. This is why it would be absurd to assert a space in the university for the continued development of anarchist thought in an institutionalized way, for instance as a department of anarchist studies or similar form. What at first might seem as if it could be quite a victory for subversion could just as easily be turned into another profit-making mechanism for the university, creating the image of subversion while raking in tuition fees. There are numerous programs as well as institutions (to remain nameless for the moment) who constantly turn their ?radical image? into an improved bottom line while all the while operating on a solidly neoliberal basis, strangely enough without this seeming to sully the luster of their radical credentials. Meanwhile, institutions that have attempted to run their operations in line with their stated politics have endured a whole host of other pressures and dynamics leading to many difficulties including programs closing down.(8) This makes the position of the subversive intellectual in the academy quite odd, precisely because the finding of space might be the very act of delivering capital its future. But in other sense, given capital?s dehumanizing tendencies, no one is ever in a comfortable relationship to it. As argued by Stefano Harney and Fred Moten, the role of the subversive intellectual in (but not of) the university, is like a thief who steals what she can from it, using the space to form a ?collective orientation to the knowledge object as future project.?(9) This would be to utilize the space provided by the university, not as a goal in itself, nor to assert one?s right to such a space, but to accomplish something within this space. In other words the fact that one has managed to create a space to discuss anarchist politics does not mean that one has accomplished anything just by that in terms of creating a more ?radical? university. It is what one does with this space that is the core politics within the university more so necessarily than the specific content. In this way at times an engaged but tepid liberal politics can very well yield material effects and outcomes that are more radical in their effect than a radical politics without means of its own realization. It is a politics based more on process and ethics of transformation rather than the claiming of territory. However, radical knowledge production does not form itself as a fixed object and space, but one that constantly moves and morphs across disciplines, frontiers, ideas, and spaces. It is a form of knowledge production that comes not from a perspective of separation but rather constant self-institution and questioning of the foundations that support it. Rather than necessarily assert and affirm an identity or space, these forms of knowledge production develop in exodus, in the maroons and hidden alcoves of the university, in the constantly moving spaces that James Scott and Robin D.G. Kelley call the hidden transcript. (10) This hidden social transcript encompasses not just speech but also an array of practices bound to the particular location?which is both mediated and created by those practices?and so is marked between such and the public transcript often through ongoing struggle and contestation. Between the hidden and public transcripts exists a third realm of politics, ?a politics of disguise and anonymity that takes place in public view but is designed to have a double meaning or to shield the identity of the actor.?(11) Arguably, the overlooking of this space might in many ways suit the needs of the social actors who articulate their freedom dreams by constantly reinventing and reinterpreting their cultural practices as a part of this third realm of politics, of the infrapolitics of resistance that creates a space for dreams of transcendence and autonomy to exist in a seen (yet unseen) manner. Radical academics, when they find a space in the academy, can use their position to create room and possibilities for organizers to use it for their ends, to orient their work towards the needs and desires of organizing, rather than fixing them as objects of study. This it to think about the autonomous institution of the nomadic educational machine as a process of subjectivation, on constant becoming, which avoids fixed institutionalization: as the constant movement of constituent power through the undercommons, as one more instance of creating a transformation machine for the development of radical subjectivity exterior to capital?s appropriation without needing necessary to find a physical exteriority to capital. The undercommons exist as the forms of self-organization developed by the despised and discounted who no longer seek to develop a form through which their marginalization be can countered by a recognized form of being in public. In other words the undercommons are the spaces in which forms of self-organization exist that no longer seek the approval or recognition of their existence but more often than not get along much better without it.(12) This is not an institution in any sort of Habermasian sense with clearly defined speech acts and reasonable debate. The nomadic educational machine rather is a transformation machine;(13) it is a process for structuring an exteriority of knowledge production to the dynamics of capitalist valorization through educational labor and production, an exteriority that is not necessarily physical but often temporal, intensive, and affective in its nature. This is the problem (or one of them) that confronts ?anarchist studies.? What might seem at first a relatively straightforward phrase quickly becomes more complicated. What does anarchist studies mean and who will benefit from establishing this field of study? All too easily, anarchist studies become nothing more than the study of anarchism and anarchists by anarchists, weaving a strange web of self- referentiality and endless rehashing of the deeds and ideas of bearded 19th century European males. This is perhaps a bit too harsh, but is in general an accurate observation. That of course is not to deny or denigrate the importance and value of movement histories and studies, as they often provide a wealth of insight and information. The problem is when seemingly all other forms of knowledge production that could be encompassed within the framework of anarchist studies become forgotten within the endless repetition of the same histories and ideas. By too easily slipping ?anarchist studies? into the ?study of anarchism,? the of has constructed anarchism as a pre-given object that one stands outside as object of knowledge that can be examined, probed, and prodded, rather than as a common space of political elaboration and the development of new ideas and knowledge as a part of this politics. In other words what is lost is the sense of anarchist studies as the elaboration of ideas and knowledges useful to further developing anarchist politics, such as studying the workings of healthcare to financial markets, from the movement of emboli to the movement of the social, approached from a way that is deeply connected to questions posed by social movement and struggles. In either case it is an approach to knowledge production geared toward the twin imperatives of creating blockages in circuits of oppressive forms of power as well as prefiguring liberatory forms of sociality. There is also a tendency in this dynamic to reduce anarchism to its linguistic instantiation that then further reduces it to only a specific kind of politics.(14) In other words, we cannot reduce anarchism to the mere use of the word ?anarchism,? but rather might highlight and propose social relations based on cooperation, self-determination, and negating hierarchal roles. From this perspective, one can find a much richer and more global tradition of social and political thought and organization that while not raising a black flag in the air is very useful for expanding the scope of human possibilities in a liberatory direction. The conjunction of anarchism and anthropology has been quite useful in this regard.(15) There is also much to learn from postcolonial thought, queer studies, black and Chicano studies, cultural studies, and feminism. Some of the most interesting anarchist thought to emerge within recent years has explored these conjunctions and connections with great success.(16) The workings of the nomadic educational machine are closer to the operations of a diffuse cultural politics than what would be commonly recognized as an educational project. David Weir makes the intriguing argument that anarchism?s great success as a form of cultural politics (particularly within the spheres of art, music, and in creative fields generally) is because of the inability to realize anarchism?s political goals in other ways.(17) But there is more to it than an inability to realize political goals, particularly when the realization of these goals is almost always understood to be the creation of a hegemonic space or situation, such as replacing a particular territorial nation-state with a newly created anarchist non-state. Rather than seeing the success of anarchist cultural politics as connected to a failure to create hegemonic forms, one can see it rather as based on a continued refusal of institutionalizing forms that contradict the nature of anarchist politics. It is seeing the educational dynamics that exist within the hidden configurations of knowledge production circulating in the undercommons, a process that is just as much about the articulation of ideas through the arts and culture. The nomadic educational machine is a fish that swims in the secret drift of history that connects medieval heresy to punk rock, from Surrealism to Tom Waits; and it is this submerged history from which insurgent movements draw theoretical and imaginal substance and inspiration from, to forge tools and weapons for resistance.(18) The nomadic educational machine exists as a diasporic process of knowledge creation within the undercommons. But more than existing within a diasporic configuration, the workings of the nomadic educational machine are necessary for the articulation of this space itself. That is to say that there are forms of knowledge and interaction that constitute a particular space and an approach to education such that it is not clear or perhaps even possible within such to clearly delineate where education and life are different. Paul Gilroy, in his description of the black Atlantic as a transnational, transversal space created by the movement of blacks across the Atlantic, suggests the idea of a partially hidden public sphere.(19) The black Atlantic, constituted by the movement of black people both as objects of slavery, colonialism, and oppressive forces as well as in motion seeking autonomy and freedom through real and imaginary border crossing, can be considered part of this space. While the space described is certainly visible in the physical sense, it is nonetheless a space of history, politics, and social interaction that has often been overlooked as a site of cultural production and analysis. There are a variety of reasons for the overlooking of spaces such as the black Atlantic as a site of cultural analysis and production. In addition to longstanding racism and conceptions of displaced people as having no history or culture (or at least not one that deserves the same level of analysis of others forms of culture or history) that preclude a serious consideration of such a space, are factors created by the relative inability of the social sciences (sociology in particular) to analyze social forms outside the nation- state. The social sciences, having evolved concomitantly with the rise of the modern rationalized nation-state, tacitly assume that social and cultural phenomena correspond to national and state boundaries, and are often read as if it were the case even when it is not so. The continued existence of ethnic absolutism and cultural nationalism also creates difficulties in analyzing forms of cultural production that violate these clearly defined political, racial, and cultural boundaries which are assumed to constitute natural pre- existing fixed and immutable categories. The creativity of what the nomadic educational machine is the articulation, preservation, and reinterpretation of cultural and social forms as part of this partially hidden public sphere, as a part of the hidden transcript. The public transcript, or the self- representation of power, more often than not totally excludes and often denies the existence of the social forms developed in this partially hidden public sphere. But this exclusion from the gaze of power, in the blackness of the undercommons, is not necessarily something to be decried or banished, but could very well provide the basis upon which to build a radical cultural politics not instantly subsumed within the optic of the spectacle and the mechanisms of governance. Indeed, there is often a great effort put forth in what Roger Farr (building on Alice Becker-Ho?s work on gypsy slang) describes as a strategy of concealment, one which builds affective and intense bonds and politics around the refuge of the opaque space, the indecipherable gesture.(20) Jack Bratich has also done very interesting work on the panics that secrecy, or even just the appearance of secrecy, has caused within the left and more broadly. While some concern is valid around closed circles (perhaps to avoid the emergence of informal hierarchies, as Jo Freeman has famously argued), one cannot forget how much of the history of revolts and insurrections are founded upon conspiracies both open and not, with the ability to cloak such plans oftentimes quite important to their success or even mere survival.(21) It would be arguable that in a sense the overlooking of this space in many ways suits the needs of the social actors who articulate their freedom dreams. Constantly reinventing and reinterpreting their cultural practices as a part of this third realm of politics, the infrapolitics of resistance creates a space for dreams of transcendence and autonomy to exist in a seen yet unseen manner. This corresponds well with the two notions of politics that Gilroy poses: the politics of fulfillment (?the notion that a future society will be able to realize the social and political promise that present society has left unaccomplished. It creates a medium in which demands for goals like non-racialized justice and rational organization of the productive processes can be expressed?) and the politics of transfiguration (which ?emphasizes the emergence of new desires, social relations, and modes of association?. and resistance between that group and its erstwhile oppressors?).(22) While he describes the politics of fulfillment as much more willing to play along with western rationality and the dynamics of the state political process (and thus to exist in full view), the politics of transfiguration has a profoundly different character that makes such unlikely. The politics of transfiguration focuses on the sublime and the creation of new forms of social relations and realities. Thus while the politics of fulfillment can show its designs in full view (for the most part), the politics of transfiguration have a more subversive character, that which expresses itself in the partial concealment of double coded articulations and the infrapolitics of the partially hidden public sphere. It is in this space that the arts figure so prominently. The formation of the space itself, as a site for interaction, can itself be considered a form of social sculpture or aesthetic activity. And in so far as it also creates channels for the development and articulation of knowledge through social interaction, also a form of education. From folk songs to tap dancing, theater, tales, and more recently movies, are all involved in creating what Gilroy describes as ?a new topography of loyalty and identity in which the structures and presuppositions of the nation-state have been left behind because they are seen to be outmoded.?(23) This is the space, as much as it isn?t a space at all, where the freedom dreams that Kelley explores come to be and are retold, reinterpreted, and re-dreamt in a million new combinations. Although Kelley laments that in a world where getting paid and living ostentatiously seem to be held as the ends of the black freedom movement, this is the space where to build radically democratic public cultures, to acknowledge and foster the social force of creativity and imagination.(24) In its transmutable, transversal form created and maintained by these articulations that enable there to be discussion about creating a radically democratic public culture even if the existing political context or situation prevents such conversations from happening openly. The diasporic aesthetic, which characterizes the form of appearance of the nomadic educational machine (as well as its partial non- appearance), is the social function and creativity displayed by the articulations of those who through displacement and marginalization must partially hide or conceal sections of their expression, often times in plain view, so that they may continue to exist under marginalizing or oppressive conditions. It is the voice, to borrow from the ideas of the Zapatistas, which must hide itself in order to be seen. It is the expression of those who bow before the master during the day in order to pilfer the grain warehouse at night. It is the space created by, containing, and sustained by the articulations and dreams of those who dream out loud in semi-opaque manners. It is not the will be misunderstood, but rather a question of who wants to be understood by, and who wants to remain an incomprehensible glyph towards. As Nietzsche once observed, the only thing worse than being misunderstood is being totally understood, for that is indeed truly the end. There is an odd parallel between social scientists that have difficulty understanding and theorizing liminal and recombinant spaces as those in diasporas and the of-going failure of well intentioned, largely white progressive political forces to appreciated forms of resistance and subversion that occur within displaced communities in an on going manner. As traditionally sociologists have seem stymied by non-state forms of social analysis, the left in general often fails to appreciate politics aside from marches, rallies, and other visible manifestations. But the result is similar: the failure to understand a large segment of social reality because it is does not jive with existing conceptual and analytical frames of reference. And if there is anywhere that an actual anarchist educational project can find a home, it is here within these spaces and enclaves, rather than in the brightly lit halls of academia or in the company of polite conversation. It is this task of the constant renewal of the grounds of politics, of finding a way to create a space for subversion, sabotage, and learning within social movement, that is the task of the nomadic educational machine. It is also the same process engaged in by people drawing from the history of militant inquiry and research within autonomist politics.(25) This is a constantly renewing process, not a onetime thing but rather an orientation towards tracing out the development of the grounds on which struggles occur and constantly rethinking on those shifting grounds. It becomes the task of continuing in the tradition of nomadic thought, of embodying and working with philosophy as described by Deleuze and Guattari, which is to say in the creation of concepts through processes of deterritorialization and reterritorialization. Calling forth ?not the one who claims to be pure but rather an oppressed, bastard, lower, anarchical, nomadic, and irremediably minor race? it is this double becoming that constitutes the people to come and the new earth.?(26)

# 2AC

## Anti-Blackness

### AT: Kritik

#### 2 arguments –

#### First, the neg speaks for others, recreating the harms they try to solve

#### Second, they create static identity – that makes solving oppression impossible

Manuel Callahan, Professor of Race relations at Humboldt State University, 2005, “Why not share a dream? Zapatismo as Political and Cultural Practice,” http://www.jstor.org/stable/23263123

While we should not abandon the responsibilities and challenges of sincere solidarity work, taking our cues from the EZLN, we might suggest that Zapatismo invites people to become part of "the struggle" in their own manner, at their own pace, and without being measured by any specific model of "conscientization" or a political program specified by "the organization." However, the effort at encuentro challenges us to interrogate the limitations and contradictions of more traditional solidarity activism. Zapatismo reveals the political tensions of building a movement based only on single issue campaigns, on behalf of a specific constituency, and relying on short-lived fragile coalitions often over-determined by the most immediate crisis. In many cases those solidarity efforts that fail to escape a liberal mold can unwittingly promote possessive individualism, celebrating a single leader, often considered the best and the brightest of the group, who is expected to state the group's issues, history, strategies and goals. The result is a single model, plan, or program dominated by an elite. Consequently, a narrowly defined solidarity effort can easily reproduce paternalism and hierarchy within the organization and between the organization and the constituency being "served." Echoing Holloway's warning in this volume, traditional solidarity projects fall into the trap of defining, representing, and speaking for the struggle(s) of others, while at the same moment insisting on "the progress" of those being aided, making solidarity efforts resistant to modifications and slow to adapt to shifting contexts. Solidarity projects that represent, define and speak for the struggle (s) of others presuppose the progress of those being aided and not the transformation of those pro viding the aid. Moreover, aide workers operating in a narrow solidarity mode are less likely to acknowledge or celebrate the transformations that have already taken place in "targeted" com munities, inadvertently facilitating an insidious imperialism. Professional well-funded NGOs, for example, "can become shadow bureaucracies parallel to Southern nation state administrations."30 Ultimately, a bureaucratic model of social change will not be able to prioritize and promote the transformation of those pro viding the aid. Although there may be valid concerns we must interrogate regarding the challenges of "solidarity," the political practice examined here does not seek to impose a rigidly defined alternative practice. The Zapatistas have been consistent in keeping with what they have argued is the task of an armed movement: to "present the problem, and then step aside."31 As critical catalysts in posing problems they have deliberately not posed solutions on other groups or spaces. "But it is already known that our specialty is not in solving problems, but in creating them. 'Creating them?' No, that is too presumptuous, rather in proposing. Yes, our specialty is proposing problems."32 The Zapatista provocation insists that rights emerge from collective identities and communal needs expressing collectively articulated obligations and not the competing interests of individual need.33 Rather than emphasize networks as our only organizing objective, we might also imagine the movement in solidarity with the Zapatistas as an imagined community, a collective effort to define obligations that are rooted in a locally placed culture generating knowledge about what works across generations. The very act of provocation undertaken has been a bridge manifest in a new international, not an international based on rigid party doctrines or dogmas of competing organizations but "an international of hope." The new international is defined by dignity, "that nation without nationality, that rain bow that is also a bridge, that murmur of the heart no matter what blood lives it, that rebel irreverence that mocks borders, customs and wars."34 "Instead of a new bureaucratic apparatus, for the world coordination of a political movement expressing universal ideals and proposals," Esteva explains, "the International of Hope was created: a web constituted by innumerable differentiated autonomies, without a center or hierarchies, within which the most varied coalitions of discontents can express themselves, to dismantle forces and regimes oppressing all of them."35 The process of creating political space for dialogue between a diverse number of constituencies occupying a particular space suggests that community is neither homogenous nor static. Rather than speak of "the community," Zapatismo strives for a notion of community embodying a multiplicity of histories, experiences, resources, and obligations. The pursuit of new political relationships underscores the need to re-discover strategies to collectively define obligations of and within a community through dialogue based on respect. Political projects and proposals need to emerge organically—not imposed either by an individual (caciquismo) or a cabal (protagonismo). As the Frente Zapatista de Liberacion Nacional (FZLN) have warned, people organizing themselves must begin "with the situation in which they find themselves, not in the one which we might desire to be found."36 In new political spaces all voices, all proposals must be responded to with respect. Democracy, as Marcos suggests, is a gesture "to decide upon the dominant social proposal." Liberty implies the freedom necessary to pursue one action over another, the expression of desire for the fulfillment of hope and dignity. Free from oppression, fear or persecution liberty sustains diversity and the choice, "to subscribe to one or another proposal."37 "It is," writes Marcos, "the same desire: democracy, liberty, and justice. In the heroic delirium of the Mexican southeast, hope implies a name: Tachicam, the unity of long ing for a better future."

### AT: Alt

#### Singularity disad – they paper over the ways oppression constitutes itself in different ways than just antiblackness – makes alt solvency impossible

Simon Tormey, Head of the School of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Sydney, 2006, ‘Not in my Name’: Deleuze, Zapatismo and the Critique of Representation”

Thinking more generally about the socio-political ideology of Zapatismo, what becomes evident is the reluctance to commit themselves to a ‘vision’ or blueprint of how the world should be transformed, or indeed how even the Chiapas should be transformed. This again is a source of irritation for otherwise sympathetic onlookers who would like to see in the Zapatistas the vanguard of an attempt to construct a viable ‘counter- empire’ of the kind influentially discussed by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri in their controversial work Empire. Surely it is asked, there must be some notion of what the world should look like in order to mobilise people against the world as it is now? Again, the notion that ‘resistance against’ can only make sense when seen as the antonym of a ‘resistance for’, in this case in favour of a distinct political system or space is one that is challenged both implicitly and explicitly by Zapatista practice. As Marcos insists: Zapatismo is not an ideology, it is not bought and paid for by a doctrine. It is … an intuition. Something so open and flexible that it really occurs in all places. Zapatismo poses the question: ‘What is it that excluded me?’‘What is that has isolated me?’ In each place the response is different. Zapatismo simply states the question and stipulates that the response is plural, that the response is inclusive … 29 In attempting to elaborate what Zapatismo is, communiqués articulate the idea of ‘a political force’ that operates in negation to that which is, as opposed to the embodiment of something that has yet to be created. In this sense they directly eschew the idea of a government or system ‘in waiting’ as per the classic ‘putschist’ rhetoric of traditional revolutionary movements. As has often been noted, they have yet to articulate a response to the ‘land question’, which is the very issue that caused the Zapatistas to come into being in the first place. Zapatismo is ‘silent’ on this and all the other matters that have animated left radicals over the past two centuries, that have nurtured them in the ‘hard times’, and helped to maintain their faith that history is on their side. But the ‘silence’ is surely telling in positive ways. As we noted at the outset, this is a political force that prefers not to ‘speak’, but rather to ‘listen’ and provide what Marcos terms an ‘echo’ of what it ‘hears’. As Marcos notes, this would be: An echo that recognises the existence of the other and does not overpower or attempt to silence it. An echo that takes its place and speaks its own voice, yet speaks with the voice of the other. An echo that reproduces its own sound, yet opens itself to the sound of the other. An echo […] transforming itself and renewing itself in other voices. An echo that turns itself into many voices, into a network of voices that, before Power’s deafness, opts to speak to itself, knowing itself to be one and many, acknowledging itself to be equal in its desire to listen and be listened to, to recognising itself as diverse in the tones and levels of voices forming it.30 To Marcos this is a different kind of political practice. It is one that insists that there are no a priori truths that can be handed down to ‘The People’; there is no doctrine that has to be learned or spelled out; there is only ‘lived experience’. Zapatismo is a political force that is concerned with the means by which people can be ‘present’ as opposed to being represented, whether it be by political parties, ideologies, or the other familiar devices and strategies that have prevented voices being heard. To quote Marcos, what they are struggling for is a world in which ‘all worlds are possible’. Similarly In The Second Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle, Marcos declares (on behalf of the Zapatistas) that: ‘we aren’t proposing a new world, but something preceding a new world; an antechamber looking into the new Mexico. In this sense, this revolution will not end in a new class, faction of a class, or group in power. It will end in a free and democratic space for political struggle’.30 Their struggle is one to permit other conceptions of the world to come into being. Of course this is punctuated by a view of what it is that such spaces require: the obliteration of party machines, of the bloated and antique structures of representation that clog Mexico’s political system; but the point is such strictures are regarded as the basis upon which a genuine political process can take place. What is left out is any ‘final’ account of justice, equality or democracy. Contrast Zapatismo in other words, with traditional revolutionary rhetoric and more particularly with the communist struggles of the past with their tightly knit, disciplined hierarchies built on a thorough going utilitarianism that is prepared, as Trotsky once bluntly put it, ‘to break eggs to make an omelette’. In Zapatismo we find on the contrary a sentiment that insists that all the ‘eggs’ are of value. It is ‘dignity’ and ‘respect’ for the singular voice that animates this struggle against representation, not a desire to fulfil the historical or foreordained destiny to which all voices are or will be subject. In this sense as in the other senses discussed here, it seems to me that this is a very Deleuzian kind of struggle, and Deleuze (and Guattari) anticipate on the plane of high theory the kinds of demands being articulated by Marcos and the Zapatistas. This is also to say that the search for a post-representational form of political practice should not be read as necessarily ‘nihilistic’ (as Laclau insists) or as one that inevitably pits the aristocratic ‘one’ against the many. Or if it is, then it is a nihilism that, as per Deleuze’s reading of ‘eternal return’, isa struggle in which being and difference are constantly affirmed. It is an affirmation of difference itself, of the singular voice, and of the possibility of and necessity for ‘spaces’ in which those voices can be heard. In the terms offered by Deleuze and Guattari this would be ‘smooth’ space as opposed to the ‘striated’ space of representational systems. It would be a ‘deterritorialised’ space of combination and recombination in accordance with differentiated, disaggregated desires; not the territorialised space of hierarchy, fixed and known roles that define ‘identity’. In terms of Zapatismo, this is a space in which ‘all worlds are possible’and in which it is the constant combination and recombination of the indigenous peoples that determines what ‘happens’.

### AT: Antiblackness

#### Anti-blackness is not overdetermined in society – conflict isn’t always centered around whiteness and blackness – their ontological fatalism recreates colonial violence

Peter Hudson, Political Studies Department, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg , South Africa, has been on the editorial board of the Africa Perspective: The South African Journal of Sociology and Theoria: A Journal of Political and Social Theory and Transformation, and is a member of the Johannesburg Workshop in Theory and Criticism, 2013, The state and the colonial unconscious, Social Dynamics: A journal of African studies

Thus the self-same/other distinction is necessary for the possibility of identity itself. There always has to exist an outside, which is also inside, to the extent it is designated as the impossibility from which the possibility of the existence of the subject derives its rule (Badiou 2009, 220). But although the excluded place which isn’t excluded insofar as it is necessary for the very possibility of inclusion and identity may be universal (may be considered “ontological”), its content (what fills it) – as well as the mode of this filling and its reproduction – are contingent. In other words, the meaning of the signifier of exclusion is not determined once and for all: the place of the place of exclusion, of death is itself over-determined, i.e. the very framework for deciding the other and the same, exclusion and inclusion, is nowhere engraved in ontological stone but is political and never terminally settled. Put differently, the “curvature of intersubjective space” (Critchley 2007, 61) and thus, the specific modes of the “othering” of “otherness” are nowhere decided in advance (as a certain ontological fatalism might have it) (see Wilderson 2008). The social does not have to be divided into white and black, and the meaning of these signifiers is never necessary – because they are signifiers. To be sure, colonialism institutes an ontological division, in that whites exist in a way barred to blacks – who are not. But this ontological relation is really on the side of the ontic – that is, of all contingently constructed identities, rather than the ontology of the social which refers to the ultimate unfixity, the indeterminacy or lack of the social. In this sense, then, the white man doesn’t exist, the black man doesn’t exist (Fanon 1968, 165); and neither does the colonial symbolic itself, including its most intimate structuring relations – division is constitutive of the social, not the colonial division. “Whiteness” may well be very deeply sediment in modernity itself, but respect for the “ontological difference” (see Heidegger 1962, 26; Watts 2011, 279) shows up its ontological status as ontic. It may be so deeply sedimented that it becomes difficult even to identify the very possibility of the separation of whiteness from the very possibility of order, but from this it does not follow that the “void” of “black being” functions as the ultimate substance, the transcendental signified on which all possible forms of sociality are said to rest. What gets lost here, then, is the specificity of colonialism, of its constitutive axis, its “ontological” differential. A crucial feature of the colonial symbolic is that the real is not screened off by the imaginary in the way it is under capitalism. At the place of the colonised, the symbolic and the imaginary give way because non-identity (the real of the social) is immediately inscribed in the “lived experience” (vécu) of the colonised subject. The colonised is “traversing the fantasy” (Zizek 2006a, 40–60) all the time; the void of the verb “to be” is the very content of his interpellation. The colonised is, in other words, the subject of anxiety for whom the symbolic and the imaginary never work, who is left stranded by his very interpellation.4 “Fixed” into “non-fixity,” he is eternally suspended between “element” and “moment”5 – he is where the colonial symbolic falters in the production of meaning and is thus the point of entry of the real into the texture itself of colonialism. Be this as it may, whiteness and blackness are (sustained by) determinate and contingent practices of signification; the “structuring relation” of colonialism thus itself comprises a knot of significations which, no matter how tight, can always be undone. Anti-colonial – i.e., anti-“white” – modes of struggle are not (just) “psychic” 6 but involve the “reactivation” (or “de-sedimentation”)7 of colonial objectivity itself. No matter how sedimented (or global), colonial objectivity is not ontologically immune to antagonism. Differentiality, as Zizek insists (see Zizek 2012, chapter 11, 771 n48), immanently entails antagonism in that differentiality both makes possible the existence of any identity whatsoever and at the same time – because it is the presence of one object in another – undermines any identity ever being (fully) itself. Each element in a differential relation is the condition of possibility and the condition of impossibility of each other. It is this dimension of antagonism that the Master Signifier covers over transforming its outside (Other) into an element of itself, reducing it to a condition of its possibility.8 All symbolisation produces an ineradicable excess over itself, something it can’t totalise or make sense of, where its production of meaning falters. This is its internal limit point, its real:9 an errant “object” that has no place of its own, isn’t recognised in the categories of the system but is produced by it – its “part of no part” or “object small a.”10 Correlative to this object “a” is the subject “stricto sensu” – i.e., as the empty subject of the signifier without an identity that pins it down.11 That is the subject of antagonism in confrontation with the real of the social, as distinct from “subject” position based on a determinate identity.

#### The alt is a snake eating its own tail – ontologically opposing Blackness to Whiteness makes Black struggle STRUCTURALLY dependent on the existence of White Racism and wounded attachments to suffering.

Pinn 2004 (Anthony, Anthony B. Pinn is an American professor and writer whose work focuses on liberation theology, Black religion, and Black humanism. Pinn is the Agnes Cullen Arnold Professor of Humanities and Professor of Religious Studies at Rice University, “‘‘Black Is, Black Ain’t’’: Victor Anderson, African American Theological Thought, and Identity,” Dialog: A Journal of Theology, Volume 43, Number 1 . Spring 2004

This connection between ontological blackness and religion is natural because: ‘‘ontological blackness signifies the totality of black existence, a binding together of black life and experience. In its root, religio, religion denotes tying together, fastening behind, and binding together. Ontological blackness renders black life and experience a totality.’’13 According to Anderson, Black theological discussions are entangled in ontological blackness. And accordingly, discussions of black life revolve around a theological understanding of Black experience limited to suffering and survival in a racist system. The goal of this theology is to find the ‘‘meaning of black faith’’ in the merger of black cultural consciousness, icons of genius, and post-World War II Black defiance. An admirable goal to be sure, but here is the rub: Black theologians speak, according to Anderson, in opposition to ontological whiteness when they are actually dependent upon whiteness for the legitimacy of their agenda. Furthermore, ontological blackness’s strong ties to suffering and survival result in blackness being dependent on suffering, and as a result social transformation brings into question what it means to be black and religious. Liberative outcomes ultimately force an identity crisis, a crisis of legitimation and utility. In Anderson’s words: Talk about liberation becomes hard to justify where freedom appears as nothing more than defiant self-assertion of a revolutionary racial consciousness that requires for its legitimacy the opposition of white racism. Where there exists no possibility of transcending the blackness that whiteness created, African American theologies of liberation must be seen not only as crisis theologies; they remain theologies in a crisis of legitimation.14 This conversation becomes more ‘‘refined’’ as new cultural resources are unpacked and various religious alternatives acknowledged. Yet the bottom line remains racialization of issues and agendas, life and love. Falsehood is perpetuated through the ‘‘hermeneutic of return,’’ by which ontological blackness is the paradigm of Black existence and thereby sets the agenda of Black liberation within the ‘‘postrevolutionary context’’ of present day USA. One ever finds the traces of the Black aesthetic which pushes for a dwarfed understanding of Black life and a sacrifice of individuality for the sake of a unified Black ‘faith’. Yet differing experiences of racial oppression (the stuff of ontological blackness) combined with varying experiences of class, gender and sexual oppression call into question the value of their racialized formulations. Implicit in all of this is a crisis of faith, an unwillingness to address both the glory and guts of Black existence—nihilistic tendencies that, unless held in tension with claims of transcendence, have the potential to overwhelm and to suffocate. At the heart of this dilemma is friction between ontological blackness and ‘‘contemporary postmodern black life’’—issues, for example related to ‘‘selecting marriage partners, exercising freedom of movement, acting on gay and lesbian preferences, or choosing political parties.’’15 How does one foster balance while embracing difference as positive? Anderson looks to Nietzsche. European genius, complete with its heroic epic, met its match in the aesthetic categories of tragedy and the grotesque genius revived and espoused by Friedreich Nietzsche. The grotesque genius served as an effective counter-discourse by embracing both the ‘light’ and ‘dark’ aspects of life, and holding in tension oppositional sensations—pleasure and pain, freedom and oppression.16 Utilizing Nietzsche’s work, Anderson ask: ‘‘what should African American cultural and religious criticism look like when they are no longer romantic in inspiration and the cult of heroic genius is displaced by the grotesquery—full range of expression, actions, attitudes, behaviors everything found in African American life—of contemporary black expressive culture and public life?’’17 Applied to African Americans, the grotesque embodies the full range of African American life—all expressions, actions, attitudes, and behavior. With a hermeneutic of the grotesque as the foci, religio-cultural criticism is free from the totalizing nature of racial apologetics and the classical Black aesthetic. By extension, Black theology is able to address both issues of survival (Anderson sees their importance.) and the larger goal of cultural fulfillment, Anderson’s version of liberation. That is to say, placing ‘‘blackness’’ along side other indicators of identity allows African Americans to define themselves in a plethora of ways while maintaining their community status. This encourages African Americans to see themselves as they are— complex and diversified—no longer needing to surrender personal interests for the sake of monolithic collective status.

#### Black optimism is comparatively better – it allows for actual structural positive changes

**Moten 7** Fred, Professor of English and African American Studies, Duke University "black optimism/black operation", Chicago -- working text for "Black Op" Source: [PMLA](http://www.mlajournals.org/loi/pmla), Volume 123, Number 5, October 2008, pp. 1743–1747 (5)

http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=3&cad=rja&ved=0CDQQFjAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Flucian.uchicago.edu%2Fblogs%2Fpoliticalfeeling%2Ffiles%2F2007%2F12%2Fmoten-black-optimism.doc&ei=1fE2UO65KuG8yAHpiIHYCg&usg=AFQjCNE8N66fQjQ7TP0PkJ0eYZDI6cNLvA&sig2=BUrcwC5Cfz5Ero2I14PBsg

My field is black studies. In that field, I’m trying to hoe the hard row of beautiful things. I try to study them and I also try to make them. Elizabeth Alexander says “look for color everywhere.” For me, color + beauty = blackness which is not but nothing other than who, and deeper still, where I am. This shell, this inhabitation, this space, this garment—that I carry with me on the various stages of my flight from the conditions of its making—is a zone of chromatic saturation troubling any ascription of impoverishment of any kind however much it is of, which is to say in emergence from, poverty (which is, in turn, to say in emergence from or as an aesthetics or a poetics of poverty). The highly cultivated nature of this situated volatility, this emergent poetics of the emergency, is the open secret that has been the preoccupation of black studies. But it must be said now—and I’ll do so by way of a cool kind of accident that has been afforded us by the danger and saving power that is power point—that there is a strain of black studies that strains against black studies and its object, the critique of western civilization, precisely insofar as it disavows its aim (blackness or the thinking of blackness, which must be understood in what some not so strange combination of Nahum Chandler and Martin Heidegger might call its paraontological distinction from black people). There was a moment in Rebecca’s presentation when the image of a black saxophonist (I think, but am not sure, that it was the great Chicago musician Fred Anderson) is given to us as a representative, or better yet a denizen (as opposed to citizen), of the “space of the imagination.” What’s cool here, and what is also precisely the kind of thing that makes practitioners of what might be called the new ~~black~~ studies really mad, is this racialization of the imagination which only comes fully into its own when it is seen in opposition, say, to that set of faces or folks who constituted what I know is just a part of Lauren’s tradition of Marxist historiographical critique. That racialization has a long history and begins to get codified in a certain Kantian discourse, one in which the imagination is understood to “produce nothing but nonsense,” a condition that requires that “its wings be severely clipped by the imagination.” What I’m interested in, but which I can only give a bare outline of, is a two-fold black operation—one in which Kant moves toward something like a thinking of the imagination as blackness that fully recognizes the irreducible desire for this formative and deformative, necessarily supplemental necessity; one in which black studies ends up being unable to avoid a certain sense of itself as a Kantian, which is to say anti-Kantian and ante-Kantian, endeavor. The new black studies, or to be more precise, the old-new black studies, since every iteration has had this ambivalence at its heart, can’t help but get pissed at the terrible irony of its irreducible Kantianness precisely because it works so justifiably hard at critiquing that racialization of the imagination and the racialized opposition of imagination (in its lawless, nonsense producing freedom) and critique that turns out to be the condition of possibility of the critical philosophical project. There is a voraciously instrumental anti-essentialism, **powered in an intense and terrible way by good intentions**, that is the intellectual platform from which **black studies’ disavowal of its object** and aim is launched, even when that disavowal comes in something which also thinks itself to be moving in the direction of that object and aim. I’m trying to move by way of a kind of resistance to that anti-essentialism, one that requires a paleonymic relation to blackness; I’m trying to own a certain dispossession, the underprivilege of being-sentenced to this gift of constantly escaping and to standing in for the fugitivity (to echo Natahaniel Mackey, Daphne Brooks and Michel Foucault) (of the imagination) that is an irreducible property of life, persisting in and against every disciplinary technique while constituting and instantiating not just the thought but that actuality of the outside that is what/where blackness is—as space or spacing of the imagination, as condition of possibility and constant troubling of critique. It’s annoying to perform what you oppose, but I just want you to know that I ain’t mad. I loved these presentations, partly because I think they loved me or at least my space, but mostly because they were beautiful. I love Kant, too, by the way, though he doesn’t love me, because I think he’s beautiful too and, as you know, a thing of beauty is a joy forever. But even though I’m not mad, I’m not disavowing that strain of black studies that strains against the weight or burden, the refrain, the strain of being-imaginative and not-being-critical that is called blackness and that black people have had to carry. Black Studies strains against a burden that, even when it is thought musically, is inseparable from constraint. But my optimism, **black optimism**, is bound up with what it is to claim blackness and the appositional, runaway black operations that have been thrust upon it. The burden, the constraint, is the aim, the paradoxically aleatory goal that animates escape in and the possibility of escape from. Here is one such black op—a specific, a capella instantiation of strain, of resistance to constraint and instrumentalization, of the propelling and constraining force of the refrain, that will allow me to get to a little something concerning the temporal paradox of, and the irruption of ecstatic temporality in, optimism, which is to say black optimism, which is to say blackness. I play this in appreciation for being in Chicago, which is everybody’s sweet home, everybody’s land of California, as Robert Johnson puts it. This is music from a Head Start program in Mississippi in the mid-sixties and as you all know Chicago is a city in Mississippi, Mississippi a (fugue) state of mind in Chicago. “Da Da Da Da,” The Child Development Group of Mississippi, Smithsonian Folkways Records, FW02690 1967 The temporal paradox of optimism—that it is, on the one hand, necessarily futurial so that optimism is an attitude we take towards that which is to come; but that it is, on the other hand, in its proper Leibnizian formulation, an assertion not only of the necessity but also of the rightness and the essential timelessness of the always already existing, resonates in this recording. It is infused with that same impetus that drives a certain movement, in Monadology, from the immutability of monads to that enveloping of the moral world in the natural world that Leibniz calls, in Augustinian echo/revision, “the City of God.” With respect to C. L. R. James and José (Muñoz), and a little respectful disrespect to Lee Edelman, these children are the voices of the future in the past, the voices of the future in our present. In this recording, this remainder, their fugitivity, remains, for me, in the intensity of their refrain, of their straining against constraint, cause for the optimism they perform. That optimism always lives, which is to say escapes, in the **assertion of a right to refuse**, which is, as Gayatri Spivak says, the first right: an instantiation of **a collective negative tendency** to differ, to resist the regulative powers that resistance, that differing, call into being. To think resistance as originary is to say, in a sense, that we have what we need, that we can get there from here, that there’s nothing wrong with us or even, in this regard, with here, even as it requires us still to think about why it is that difference calls the same, that resistance calls regulative power, into existence, thereby securing the vast, empty brutality that characterizes here and now. Nevertheless, however much I keep trouble in mind, and therefore, in the interest of making as much trouble as possible, I remain hopeful insofar as I will have been in this very collective negative tendency, this little school within and beneath school that we gather together to be. For a bunch of little whiles, this is our field (i.e., black studies), our commons or undercommons or underground or outskirts and it will remain so as long as it claims its **fugitive proximity to blackness**, which I will claim, with ridiculousness boldness, **is the condition of possibility of politics**.

#### Wilderson’s totalizing account of blackness is flawed and overly US centric

Dr. Saer Maty Ba, Professor of Film – University of Portsmouth and Co-Editor, 2011, “The US Decentred: From Black Social Death to Cultural Transformation”, Cultural Studies Review, 17(2), September

<http://epress.lib.uts.edu.au/journals/index.php/csrj/article/viewFile/2304/2474>

A few pages into Red, White and Black, I feared that it would just be a matter of time before Wilderson’s black‐as‐social‐death idea and multiple attacks on issues and scholars he disagrees with run (him) into (theoretical) trouble. This happens in chapter two, ‘The Narcissistic Slave’, where he critiques black film theorists and books. For example, Wilderson declares that Gladstone Yearwood’s Black Film as Signifying Practice (2000) ‘betrays a kind of conceptual anxiety with respect to the historical object of study— ... it clings, anxiously, to the film‐as‐text‐as‐legitimateobject of Black cinema.’ (62) He then quotes from Yearwood’s book to highlight ‘just how vague the aesthetic foundation of Yearwood’s attempt to construct a canon can be’. (63) And yet Wilderson’s highlighting is problematic because it overlooks the ‘Diaspora’ or ‘African Diaspora’, a key component in Yearwood’s thesis that, crucially, neither navel‐gazes (that is, at the US or black America) nor pretends to properly engage with black film. Furthermore, Wilderson separates the different waves of black film theory and approaches them, only, in terms of how a most recent one might challenge its precedent. Again, his approach is problematic because it does not mention or emphasise the inter‐connectivity of/in black film theory. As a case in point, Wilderson does not link Tommy Lott’s mobilisation of Third Cinema for black film theory to Yearwood’s idea of African Diaspora. (64) Additionally, of course, Wilderson seems unaware that Third Cinema itself has been fundamentally questioned since Lott’s 1990s’ theory of black film was formulated. Yet another consequence of ignoring the African Diaspora is that it exposes Wilderson’s corpus of films as unable to carry the weight of the transnational argument he attempts to advance. Here, beyond the US‐centricity or ‘social and political specificity of [his] filmography’, (95) I am talking about Wilderson’s choice of films. For example, Antwone Fisher (dir. Denzel Washington, 2002) is attacked unfairly for failing to acknowledge ‘a grid of captivity across spatial dimensions of the Black “body”, the Black “home”, and the Black “community”’ (111) while films like Alan and Albert Hughes’s Menace II Society (1993), overlooked, do acknowledge the same grid and, additionally, problematise Street Terrorism Enforcement and Prevention Act (STEP) policing. The above examples expose the fact of Wilderson’s dubious and questionable conclusions on black film.

#### Their operation within a black-white paradigm of race relations can never be truly liberatory because it marginalizes bodies that do not fit neatly into either category.

Juan F. Perea, 10-31-1997, Professor of Law, University of Florida College of Law, “The Black/White Binary Paradigm of Race: The Normal Science of American Racial Thought,” http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1605&context=californialawreview

Hacker's omission of non-Black minority groups in his discussion of specific topics similarly suggests that these groups' experiences do not exist. Chapter nine, on segregated schooling, describes only the experience of Black segregation. This chapter makes no reference to the extensive history of segregation in education suffered by Latinos/as.39 Chapter ten asks, "What's Best for Black Children?" with no commensurate concern for other children. Similarly, Chapter eleven, on crime, discusses only perceptions of Black criminality and their interpretation. In discussing police brutality, Hacker describes only White police brutality against Blacks. There is not a single word about the similar police brutality suffered by Latino/a people at the hands of White police officers.' Nor are there any words in these chapters describing the experiences of Native Americans or Asian Americans. The greatest danger in Hacker's vision is its suggestion that non-White groups other than Blacks are not really subject to racism. Hacker seems to adopt the deservedly criticized ethnicity theory," which posits that non-White immigrant ethnics are essentially Whites-in-waiting who will be permitted to assimilate and become White.42 This is illustrated best in Chapter eight, "On Education: Ethnicity and Achievement," which offers the book's only significant discussion of non-White groups other than Blacks. Hacker describes Asians in "model minority" terms, because of high standardized test scores as a group. 3 He portrays Latinos/as as below standard, because of low test scores and graduation rates, and as aspiring immigrants. 4 Describing Asian Americans, Latinos/as and other immigrant groups, Hacker writes: Members of all these "intermediate groups" have been allowed to put a visible distance between themselves and black Americans. Put most simply, none of the presumptions of inferiority associated with Africa and slavery are imposed on these other ethnicities4 While a full rebuttal of this proposition is beyond the scope of this Article, its inaccuracy can be quickly demonstrated. Consider, for instance, the observations of historian David Weber, who described early Anglo perceptions of Mexican people: "American visitors to the Mexican frontier were nearly unanimous in commenting on the dark skin of Mexican mestizos who, it was generally agreed, had inherited the worst qualities of Spaniards and Indians to produce a 'race' still more despicable than that of either parent. '46 Rufus B. Sage expressed the common view of Mexicans in 1846: There are no people on the continent of America, whether civilized or uncivilized, with one or two exceptions, more miserable in condition or despicable in morals than the mongrel race inhabiting New Mexico.... To manage them successfully, they must needs be held in continual restraint, and kept in their place by force, if necessary,-else they will become haughty and insolent. As servants, they are excellent, when properly trained, but are worse than useless if left to themselves.47 More briefly, the common perception of Mexican Americans was that "They are an inferior race, that is all. 48 Incredibly, and without any supporting evidence, Hacker writes that "[m]ost Central and South Americans can claim a strong European heritage, which eases their absorption into the 'white' middle class."'49 Hacker continues, "[w]hile immigrants from Colombia and Cyprus may have to work their way up the social ladder, they are still allowed as valid a claim to being 'white' as persons of Puritan or Pilgrim stock."5 Hacker's comments are simply incredible for their blithe lack of awareness of how racism burdens the lives of Latino/a, Asian American and other racialized immigrant groups. While some Latinos/as may look White and may act Anglo (the phenomenon of passing for White is not limited to Blacks), Hacker's statement is certainly false for millions of Latinos/as. Current anti-immigrant initiatives targeted at Latinos/as and Asians, such as California's Proposition 1875' and similar federal legislation targeting legal and illegal immigrants,52 California's Proposition 209,53 and unprecedented proposals to deny birthright citizenship to the United States-born children of undocumented persons, debunk any notion that the White majority tolerates easily the presence of Latino/a or Asian people.' Ultimately, Hacker seems determined to adhere to the binary paradigm of race and to ignore the complexity introduced by other nonWhite groups, because it is convenient-which, it will be recalled, is a principal danger of paradigms. In the statistical section of the book, Hacker explains some of the problems with statistics he reproduces: Some government publications place persons of Hispanic origin within the black and white racial groupings. Others put them in a separate category, to differentiate them from blacks and whites. Wherever the sources permit, Two Nations has separated out Hispanics, to keep the book's emphasis on race as coherent as possible. Where this has not been possible, readers should bear in mind that the figures for whites may be inflated by the inclusion of considerable numbers of Hispanics.55 Although government publications have confused the ability to count Latinos/as,56 what is startling here is Hacker's vision that coherence in discussion of race requires emphasis on only Black and White. In other words, "real" race is only Black or White. Other groups only render this framework "incoherent." This is why the Black/White paradigm of race must be expanded: it causes writers like Hacker to ignore other non-White Americans, which in turn encourages others to ignore us as well.

#### Their focus on antiblackness smooths over different forms of racism and either discards them as irrelevant or integrates them within the logic of antiblackness. Other races are perceived “whitening” or “assimilating” to whiteness rather than facing distinct problems. This recreates the uncritical universalism of whiteness and makes alleviating racial harms impossible.

Linda Martin Alcoff, Department of Philosophy at Syracuse University, November 6th 2002, “Latino/As, Asian Americans, and the Black-White Binary,” http://www.jstor.org/stable/25115747

In fact, in Texas not only were Mexicans subject to Jim Crow in public facilities from restaurants to bathrooms, they were also excluded from business and community groups, and children of Mexican descent were required to attend a segregated school for the first four grades, whether they spoke fluent English or not. Thus, when they were classified as nonwhite, Latino/as were overtly denied certain civil rights; when they were classified as white, the de facto denial of their civil rights could not be appealed. Although the U.S. Supreme Court overturned the Supreme Court of the State of Texas decision in the Hernandez case, its final decision indicated a perplexity regarding Mexican American identity. The U.S. Supreme Court did not want to classify Mexicans as black, nor did they want to alter the legal classification of Mexicans as white; since these were the only racial terms they thought were available, they ended up explaining the discrimination Mexicans faced as based on "other differences," left undefined. Thus, oddly, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld that there was racial discrimination against Mexicans, but denied that Mexicans constituted a race. One clear lesson to be learned from this legal history is that race is a construction that is variable enough to be stretched opportunistically as the need arises to maintain and expand discrimination. The fact that Latino/as and Asians had to be put into either one of two categories - black and white - has not been of benefit to them. Nonetheless, one might take these legal cases to indicate that discrimination against African Americans was the paradigm case which U.S. courts stretched when they could to justify discrimination against other nonwhites, and thus to provide support for the black/white paradigm of race. The distinguished historian John Hope Franklin argued in this way at the first official meeting of the Race Relations Commission which was convened by former U.S. President Bill Clinton to advance his initiative for a national dialogue on race. Franklin maintained that "racism in the black/white sphere" developed first in North America when slavery was introduced in the Jamestown colony in 1619 and has served as a model for the treatment of race in the U.S. Attorney Angela Oh, also serving on the commission, argued against Franklin on this point, using the example of the uprising of April 29, 1992 in Los Angeles to show that the specific history and racist treatment of Asian Americans needs to be accounted for in order to understand what occurred during that event. "I just want to make sure we go beyond the black-white paradigm. We need to go beyond that because the world is about much more than that ..." she said.16 Frank Wu, commenting on this exchange, tries diplomatically to unite both sides, affirming that "African Americans bear the greatest bur den of racial discrimination" and that the Los Angeles uprising needs to be understood in relation both to African American history as well as Korean American history (and, I would add, Latino/a history, since Latino/as were the largest number of arrested). Wu advocates the following: Whatever any of us concludes about race relations, we should start by including all of us ... Our leaders should speak to all individuals, about every group, and for the country as a whole. A unified theory of race, race relations, and racial tensions must have whites, African Americans, and all the rest, and even within groups must include Arab Americans, Jewish Americans, white ethnicities, and so forth. Our theory is an inadequate account otherwise. The question Wu does not address directly is whether the continued acceptance of the black/white paradigm will allow such a comprehensive account. The reality of race in the U.S. has always been more complicated than black/white. The initial exclusionary laws concerning testimony in court, as mentioned earlier, grouped "blacks, mulattoes, and Native Americans." The Chinese laborers brought to the West in the 1800's had specific rulings and ideological justifications used against them, restricting their right not only to vote or own property but even to marry other Chinese. This latter ruling outlasted slavery and was justified by invoking images of Asian overpopulation. To avoid reproduction, Chinese women were allowed to come as prostitutes but not as wives, a restriction no other group faced. The Mexicans defeated in the Mexican-American War were portrayed as cruel and cowardly barbarians, and although the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo ratified in 1848 guaranteed the Mexicans who stayed in the U.S. full rights of citizenship, like the treaties with Native Americans neither local govern ments nor the federal courts upheld the Mexicans right to vote or respected the land deeds they held before the Treaty. By the time of the Spanish American War of 1898 the image of barbarism used against Mexicans was consistently attributed to a Latin-Catholic heritage and expanded for use throughout Latin American and the Caribbean, thus subsequently affecting the immigrant populations coming from these countries as well as justifying U.S. claims of hegemony in the region.19 The so-called Zoot Suit riots in Los Angeles in 1943 targeted Mexicans and their ethnically specific style of dress. The attempts made to geographically sequester and also to forcibly and totally assimilate Native American groups were not experienced by any other group, and had their own ideological justifi cations that combined contradictory images of the Great Chain of Being with the romanticized Noble Savage. Native peoples were represented as vanquished, disappearing, and thus of no account. The paradigm of an antiblack racism intertwined with slavery does not help to illuminate these and other specific experiences of other nonwhite groups, where ideologies often relied on charges of evil, religious backwardness, horde mentalities, being a disappearing people, and other projections not used in regard to African Americans. The hegemony of the black/white paradigm has stymied the development of an adequate account of the diverse racial realities in the U.S., and weakened the general theories of racism which attempt to be truly inclusive. This has had a negative effect on our ability to develop effective solutions to the various forms racism can take, to make common cause against ethnic and race based forms of oppression and to create lasting coalitions, and has recently played a significant role in the demise of affirmative action. I will support these claims further in what follows. Critics of the black/white paradigm have argued that, although all communities of color have shared the experience of political and economic disenfranchisement in the U.S., there are significant differences between the causes and the forms of this disenfranchisement. Bong Hwan Kim, a Korean American community leader who has worked both as the Director of the Korean Community Center of East Bay in Oakland, CA, and as Director of the Korean Youth and Community Center in Los Angeles, blames the black/white binary for disabling relationships among people of color and even for creating the conditions leading to the Los Angeles civil disaster of April 1992, in which 2,300 small Korean owned busi nesses were destroyed by mostly Latino/a and African American looters. Kim cites the xenophobia marshaled by African American leader Danny Bakewell before the looting occurred, and argues that the Korean American community had been and continues to be systematically rendered incapable of responding to such rhetoric because they are not recognized in the media as a player in racial politics.20 Elaine Kim explains: It is difficult to describe how disempowered and frustrated many Korean Americans felt during and after the sa-i-ku p'ok-dong (the April 29 "riots"). Korean Americans across the country shared the anguish and despair of the Los Angeles tongp'o (community), which everyone seemed to have abandoned - the police and fire departments, black and white political leaders, the Asian and Pacific American advocates who tried to dissociate themselves from us because our tragedy disputed their narrow and risk-free focus on white violence against Asians ... the Korean Americans at the center of the storm were mostly voiceless and all but invisible (except when stereotyped as hysterically inarticulate, and mostly female, ruined shopkeepers .. .).21 Similar to the Mexicans in Texas, the Koreans have been denied the legal or socially recognized category of being a politicized group at the same time that they are made subject to group based scapegoating. Moreover, as this event demonstrates, the black/white paradigm of race is incapable of theoretically or politically addressing racism among communities of color, or racism, in other words, which is not all about white people. A response to this line of reasoning might be that it is white supremacy which is at the root of the conflictual relations among communities of color, and responsible for their acceptance of stereotypes manufactured by a white dominant power structure. Thus, on this reading, what occurred in Los Angeles can be reductively analyzed as caused by white supremacy. Although I do find explanatory arguments that focus on political economy often compelling, it is far too simplistic, as I think Karl Marx himself knew, to imagine cultural conflict as the mere epiphenomenon of economic forces with no life or grounding of their own. To blame only white supremacy for what occurred in Los Angeles would also deny power and agency to any groups but the dominant, which is increasingly untrue. We must all accept our rightful share of the blame, whatever that turns out to be in particular instances, and resist explanations that would a priori reduce that blame to zero for communities of color. Supporting the arguments of both Elaine Kim and Bong Hwan Kim, Juan Perea argues that because of the wide acceptance of the black/white paradigm, "other racialized groups like Latino/as, Asian Americans, and Native Americans are often marginalized or ignored altogether."22 He points out that the concerns of Asian Americans and Latino/as cannot be addressed through immigration legislation because all are not immigrants, which is one of the reasons to reject the claim of some ethnic theorists that these groups will follow the path of European immigrants in gradual assimilation and economic success (the other reason to reject this claim is their racialization).23 Roberto Suro argues that the black/white binary disadvantages Latino/as and other people of color who are not African Americans by forcing them to adopt the strategies of civil rights litigation even though it was "not particularly well-suited to Latino/as" who are a much more diverse group.24 For example, any meaningful redress of economic discrimination affecting Latino/as and Asian Americans will need to disaggregate these groups, as some "target of opportunity" programs today in fact do, since the gap between median incomes in Filipino and Japanese households, or between Puerto Rican and Cuban households, makes aver aging these incomes useless as an indicator of economic success. Richard Delgado argues that "If one's paradigm identifies only one group as deserving of protection, everyone else is likely to suffer." Current civil rights legislation, in Delgado's view, has provided legal advantages for African Americans, unwittingly perhaps, over other people of color. I do not take Delgado to be implying that the legislation has effectively benefited the African American population and been applied forcefully and universally, but that the language of the law, however much it has yet to be applied, identifies only one group and this is a problem. Just as the protection of the right of property advantages the propertied, and the protection of free speech increases the influence of those who are articulate and can afford microphones, TV air time, and so on ... the Equal Protection Clause produces a social good, namely equality, for those falling under its coverage - blacks and whites. These it genuinely helps - at least on occasion. But it leaves everyone else unprotected.25 Put in more general terms, these arguments can be summarized as follows: 1) The black/white paradigm has disempowered various racial and ethnic groups from being able to define their own identity, to mark their difference and specificity beyond what could be captured on this limited map. Instead of naming and describing our own identity and social circumstance, we have had descriptions foisted on us from outside. 2) Asian Americans and Latino/as have historically been ignored or marginalized in the public discourse in the U.S. on race and racism. This is a problem for two reasons, first, because it is simply unfair to be excluded from what concerns one, and second, because it has considerably weakened the analysis of race and racism in the mainstream discussions. To explain the social situation of Asian Americans or Latino/as simply in terms of their de jure and de facto treatment as nonwhites is to describe our condition only on the most shallow terms. We must be included in the discussions so that a more adequate account can be developed.

#### Your exclusive focus on antiblackness causes racial scapegoating, turning the K

Darren Lenard Hutchinson, Professor of Law at Washington College of Law, August 2004, “Critical Race Theory: History, Evolution, and New Frontiers”

Ultimately, however, the exclusive deployment of a binary black/white paradigm artificially narrows racial discourse and harms racial justice efforts. In order to construct adequate antiracist theories and to develop effective remedies for racial injustice, Critical Race Theorists must excavate the multidimensional harms that racial injustice causes, including harms that are racial but not endured by blacks. Furthermore, progressive racial politics can only survive with broad political support. The most likely support for progressive racial change comes from persons of color. Yet, the deep divisions that result from binary racial politics hinders the formation of helpful antiracist alliances. Finally, a multiracial discourse may help blacks demonstrate the pervasiveness of racial inequality. Whites tend to view racism as a relic of prior generations, and they often respond to blacks' claims of ongoing racial injustice with suspicion. n108 Moreover, [\*1203] in a white-supremacist culture, binary racial discourse obscures the experiences of discrimination experienced by Latinos and Asian Americans. n109As a result, whites argue that blacks should emulate "model minorities," usually Asian Americans, who either do not suffer from racism or do not believe that racism injures them enough to oppose it on a political level.. n110 Binary racial discourse therefore allows whites to discredit blacks' claims of racism by offering Asian Americans as proof that the United States has eradicated racial injustice, or that blacks can easily overcome what "little" racism still exists. Multiracial discourse, however, offers a powerful rebuttal to this negative and deceitful discourse. By portraying the complexity of racial inequality, Critical Race Theorists can counter a white-supremacist narrative that disparages blacks' assertions of racial injustice by deploying model minority constructs.

#### Their focus on antiblackness obscures heteronormative violence and naturalizes it in society

Hutchinson – ‘99 – Assistant Professor, Southern Methodist University School of Law (Darren Lenard Hutchinson, Winter, 1999, “Ignoring the Sexualization of Race: Heteronormativity, Critical Race Theory and Anti-Racist Politics,” 47 Buffalo L. Rev. 1, lexis)

In addition to placing anti-heterosexism beyond the domain of civil rights policy, Butler's analysis also disparages gay and lesbian equality by marginalizing gays, lesbians, bisexuals and the transgendered of color. Butler's attempt to "distinguish" blackness from "homosexuality," like the analogical approach employed by white gay and lesbian activists and theorists, treats blackness and "homo-sexuality" (and black subjugation and homophobia) as unconnected. As a result, Butler's framework erases black gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender experience and places black heterosexuals and white gays and lesbians at the center of analysis. Ironically, Butler criticizes white gay and lesbian activists for omitting "black homosexuals" from discussion through their use of the analogies. n173 His own analysis, however, makes the same omission. For example, after locating "distinctions" between "homosexuality" and blackness, Butler concludes that the "issue of social change relating to homosexuality must be divorced from issues relating to the history of blacks in America." n174 This conclusion essentializes black identity by ignoring the multiplicity of experiences within black communities. Black gay experiences, for example, cannot be "divorced" from black history. Furthermore, Butler, at various points in his analysis, explicitly limits his observations to white gays and lesbians and black heterosexuals. n175 By erasing black gays and lesbians, issues of their multidimensional oppression, the relevance of gay and lesbian equality to "black" liberation, and a discussion of what the repeal of the military's anti-gay policy might mean for gays, lesbians, bisexuals and the transgendered of color are excluded from discussion.

#### **This turns their advocacy – failure to acknowledge queer bodies retrenches power structures**

Hutchinson – ‘99 – Assistant Professor, Southern Methodist University School of Law (Darren Lenard Hutchinson, Winter, 1999, “Ignoring the Sexualization of Race: Heteronormativity, Critical Race Theory and Anti-Racist Politics,” 47 Buffalo L. Rev. 1, lexis)

My analysis expands the emergent race-sexuality critiques and my own ongoing analysis of racial and sexual oppression n24 by directing the focus of this critical scholarship to anti-racist legal theory and political discourse. My mission here is to raise and engage, in the context of anti-racism, the compelling observations of the various internal critiques of identity politics. Accordingly, this Article endeavors to demonstrate that anti-racist scholars often exhibit a misunderstanding of (or a lack of concern for) the relationship between racial oppression and other forms of subordination, particularly heterosexism and patriarchy, and that they often perpetuate heterosexism and marginalize gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered people of color in their work. As an empirical setting for discussing these claims, this Article examines the social problem of systemic violence against oppressed social groups, the anti-racist and legal responses to this violence, and more generalized discussions of heterosexism and gay and lesbian equality within anti-racist discourse and critical race theory. / The problem of violence against oppressed social groups provides an excellent setting for exploring the multidimensionality of subordination and for developing a challenge to anti-racist essentialism. As this Article reveals, published accounts and available statistical data regarding oppressive violence targeting gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered people of color indicate that much of this violence involves the use of sexual subordination to perpetuate racial harms. Despite the deployment of sexualized violence against gays, lesbians, bisexuals and the transgendered of color to further racial oppression, anti-racist theorists have not constructed a substantial critique of heterosexism in their work, nor has the issue of sexual justice for gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered people been incorporated into the agendas of most anti-racist political organizations. In fact, several anti-racist theorists have questioned the importance of including sexual identity as a protected category within existing civil rights law. / The exclusion or marginalization of issues of homosexuality from and within anti-racist discourse stands in stark contrast to the vigilance with which anti-racism has historically unveiled and challenged the sexualized nature of racial oppression. Yet, much of the historic attention paid to sexualized racial aggression has centered around heterosexual, usually male, victimization. By responding to heterosexually based racial violence and ignoring homophobic forms of racial violence, anti-racism marginalizes gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered people of color, allows racial oppression to escape the challenge of anti-racist advocacy, and creates a discriminatory and heteronormative model of racial justice.

#### Zapatismo solves – inclusionary of queer identities

Subcomandante Marcos, 1999, https://www.greenleft.org.au/node/19235

'Let those who persecute be ashamed!' MEXICO — The following is an abridged version of a statement issued by the Zapatista Army of National Liberation's (EZLN) Subcomandante Marcos on the eve of Mexico City's 21st Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Pride march. To the lesbian, gay, transsexual and bisexual community: We are grateful that you have allowed us the opportunity to say our word on this, the 21st march of Lesbian, Gay, Transsexual and Bisexual Pride, which has convened some of the best of sexual diversity in Mexico. May all of you accept the greetings of the Zapatistas on this day of struggle for the dignity of, and respect for, difference. For a very long time, homosexuals, lesbians, transsexuals and bisexuals have had to live and die concealing their difference, suffering in silence persecution, contempt, humiliation, extortion, blackmail, insults, violence and assassination. The different had to bear having their humanness reduced for the simple fact of not being in accord with a nonexistent sexual norm. This norm has been converted into a banner for intolerance and segregation. Victims at every social level, objects of jokes, gossip, insults and death, those different in their sexual preference remained quiet in the face of one of the oldest injustices in history. No more. From all social sectors, from all corners of the country, from all work places, from studies, from struggles, from life: a human demand is raised — respect and recognition for the rights of the lesbian, gay, transsexual and bisexual communities. Participating in today's jornada for the recognition of sexual diversity in a visible form are those who, fed up with hiding their different nature, have courage and a fighting spirit in their hearts and in their eyes. There is nothing to hide. Neither sexual preference, nor rage over impotence in the face of the incomprehension of a government and a sector of society that thinks that everything that is not like themselves is abnormal and grotesque. What do lesbians, homosexuals, transsexuals and bisexuals have to be ashamed of? Let those who rob and kill with impunity be ashamed: the government! Let those who persecute the different be ashamed! But it is not just those who can make themselves seen and heard who are participating in this day of struggle. Many must conceal themselves — at times from themselves — but they do not for that reason renounce a right that belongs to every human being: that of respect for their dignity, without regard to the colour of their skin, their language, their income, their culture, their religious belief, their political ideology, their weight, their stature or their sexual preference. For those who are present at this mobilisation, our admiration for your courage and audacity to make yourselves seen and heard, for your proud, dignified and legitimate "Ya basta!" [enough!]. Our best wishes to your organised existence. Our support for your struggle and your demands. We Zapatistas, men, women and other, but still Zapatistas, greet lesbian, gay, transsexual and bisexual dignity. Long life to your fighting spirit and a different tomorrow, one that is more just and human for all those who are different. From the mountains of the Mexican south-east.

#### Permutation—do both—forging common bonds between Zapatismo and black revolutionary politics is empirically possible and good.

Caleb Duarte, 11-10-2012, project coordinator, ZAPANTERA NEGRA, “The Black Panthers and the Zapatistas: An Encounter,” <https://www.kickstarter.com/projects/1561896108/the-black-panthers-and-the-zapatistas-an-encounter>

At the peak of its popularity in 1970, 139,000 copies of The Black Panther newsletter were distributed throughout the United States on a weekly basis. Within its pages, Emory Douglas, the movement’s Minister of Culture, published his artworks in an effort to “illustrate[e] conditions that made revolution seem necessary; and... construct a visual mythology of power for people who felt powerless and victimized.” The newsletter and its accompanying illustrations played a central role in the articulation of the “What We Want, What We Believe” portion of the Black Panther’s Ten Point Program In 1994, the Zapatista uprising, a Mexican, indigenous movement originating in the southern state of Chiapas, generated and disseminated a different sort of mass communication made possible by the rise of the internet. Photographic, video, and written information regarding the movement’s actions spread around the world in real time, increasing awareness of the Zapatista cause while also building solidarity for what the New York Times termed “the first post-modern revolution.” Positioning itself as a struggle against neoliberalism waged against 500 years of oppression, Zapatismo has employed new technologies of information distribution in order to articulate their wants, beliefs, and various identities to themselves and to their global audience. The Black Panther and the Zapatista movements occurred in distinct cultural, political, and historical milieus; nonetheless, the two share a common appreciation of the power of the image and the written word to build their respective social movements into personal, collective, transformative, and public experiences. In contrast to the strong self-definition established and disseminated by these two movements via pertinent media channels, today’s multimedia, plugged-in landscape seems to promote the opposite development. Today we tweet, text, and browse through myriad contexts, occasionally gaining a glimpse into the exterior world but more frequently losing ourselves in the internet’s echo chamber of opinions and perspectives. ZAPANTERA NEGRA (ZPN) will be a single-run magazine of 20,000 full-color copies that will merge the powerful imagery and layout style of Emory Douglas with the visions and voices of Zapatista painters and embroidery collectives. It will bring the two similar movements together on the page to demonstrate their commonalities, tie the movements to the present, and articulate a new, collaborative, interdisciplinary mode of information distribution and political, social, and economic self-identification.

#### Intersectionality is key – otherwise groups turn on each other, coopting both movements

Mary Samuel, 2002, **“**MANIFESTING ENCOURAGING AND RESPECTFUL ENVIRONMENTS& THE FUTURE WE WANT”

Moving towards equity with inclusive and welcoming environments requires us to deconstruct the “isms” and challenge the power dynamics that enable the “isms” to continue. The direction is clear; we must explore our own goals of social justice and be sure that we are developing personal and systemic strategies to deal with all forms of oppression. We must also have a clear understanding of the intersectionality of the “isms”; so that we can take a comprehensive rather than a compartmentalized approach in our interactions with individuals and analysize our policies, practices and procedures. We need a much more comprehensive approach to curricular or staff development and the planning process that impacts on the learning environment. We must progress beyond a simple multicultural or “additive” approach which merely requires us to add new information to augment our teaching and planning strategies about the “other” so that we may understand “them” better and make “them” feel more welcomed and included in our classrooms and workplaces. We must not use less than a “transformative” or “social action” approach to understanding, and include action on social justice issues either at the individual or systemic level. Otherwise, we will be left wondering why our good intentions and well-thought out programs, policies, and procedures are failing to reach the desired outcome of achieving equity for students and staff. The intersectionality of the “isms” adds a dimension that must constantly inform the analysis and actions of people who support and seek equity and social justice. At the personal level, the “isms” are not merely a social construct but rather a blending of all that contributes to an individual's cultural and social identity. Understanding intersectionality challenges individuals to examine the interconnectedness of their own identity. It forces us to look at the ways in which we consciously or unconsciously choose to emphasize or ignore certain aspects of our own identity, and where, when, and in relation to whom we exercise privilege and power. For example, in dealing with racism, a Black man may not notice his sexism. Similarly, many White women in the feminist movement fighting sexism could not see their own racism and the power their White privilege accorded them. Intersectionality brings into question our complicity in sustaining oppression. At the systemic or institutional level, understanding intersectionality must be a crucial aspect of our analysis so that we can fully anticipate, plan for, or respond to the goal of creating and maintaining more welcoming and inclusive environments. Failing to honour the various identities that we carry as individuals and ignoring the intersection of the “isms” at the global level will seriously impede our ability to achieve equity or equality.

#### Altermodernity is the only way to solve – antimodernity is coopted by forces of modernity

Michael Hardt, and Antonio Negri, 2011 (Michael Hardt is a Professor of Literature and Italian at Duke University. Antonio Negri is an independent researcher and writer. He has been a Lecturer in Political Science at the University of Paris and a Professor of Political Science at the University of Padua., “common wealth”, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press :)

Up to this point we have explored antimodernity as a form of resistance internal to modernity in at least three senses. First, it is not an effort to preserve the premodern or unmodern from the expanding forces of modernity but rather a struggle for freedom within the power relation of modernity. Second, antimodernity is not geographically external to but rather coextensive with modernity. European territory cannot be identified with modernity and the colonial world with antimodernity. And just as the subordinated parts of the world are equally modern, so too antimodernity runs throughout the history of the dominant world, in slave rebellions, peasant revolts, proletarian resistances, and all liberation movements. Finally, antimodernity is not temporally external to modernity in the sense that it does not simply come after the exertion of modern power, a reaction. In fact antimodernity is prior in the sense that the power relation of modernity can be exercised only over free subjects who express that freedom through resistance to hierarchy and domination. Modernity has to react to contain those forces of liberation. At this point, however, especially after having recognized the savage, excessive, monstrous character of liberation struggles, we run into the limits of the concept and practices of antimodernity. In effect, just as modernity can never extricate itself from the relationship with antimodernity, so too antimodernity is finally bound up with modernity. This is also a general limitation of the concept and practices of resistance: they risk getting stuck in an oppositional stance. We need to be able to move from resistance to alternative and recognize how liberation movements can achieve autonomy and break free of the power relation of modernity. A terminological cue from the globalization protest movements shows us a way out of this dilemma. When large demonstrations began to appear regularly at the meetings of leaders of the global system across North America and Europe in the late 1990s and the first years of the new millennium, the media were quick to label them “antiglobalization.” Participants in these movements were uncomfortable with the term because, although they challenge the current form of globalization, the vast majority of them do not oppose globalization as such. In fact their proposals focus on alternative political process – and the movements themselves constructed global networks. The name they proposed for themselves, then, rather than “antiglobalization,” was :”alterglobalization” (or altermondialiste, as is common in France.) The terminological shift suggests a diagonal line that escapes the confining play of opposites – globalization and antiglobalization – and shifts the emphasis from resistance to alternative. A Similar terminological move allows us to displace the terrain of discussions about modernity and antimodernity. Altermodernity has a diagonal relationship with modernity. It marks conflict with modernity’s hierarchies as much as does antimodernity but orients the forces of resistance more clearly toward and autonomous terrain. We should note right away, though, that the term alterrmodernity can create misunderstandings. For some the term might imply a reformist process of adapting modernity to the new global condition while rpeserving its primary characteristics. For others it might suggest alternative forms of modernity, especially as they are defined geographically and culturally, that is, a Chinese modernity, a European modernity, an Iranian modernity, and so forth. We intend for the term “altermodernity” instead to indicate[s] a decisive break with modernity and the power relation that defines it since altermodernity in our conception emerges from the traditions of antimodernity – but it also departs from antimodernity since it extends beyond opposition and resistance. Frantz Fanon’s proposition of the stages of evolution of “the colonized intellectual” provides an initial guide for how to move from modernity and antimodernity to altermodernity. In Fanon’s first stage the colonized intellectual assimilates as much as possible to European culture and thought, believing that everything modern and good and right originates in Europe, thus devaluing the colonial past and its present culture. Such an assimilated intellectual becomes more modern and more European than the Europeans, save for the dark skin color. A few courageous colonized intellectuals, however, achieve a second stage and rebel against the Eurocentrism of thought and the coloniality of power. “In order to secure his salvation,” Fanon explains, “in order to escape the supremacy of white culture the colonized intellectual feels the need to return to his unknown roots and lose himself, come what may, among his barbaric people.”61 It is easy to recognize too a whole series of parallel forms that antimodern intellectuals take in the dominant countries, seeking to escape and challenge the institutionalized hierarchies of modernity along lines of race, gender, class, or sexuality and affirm the tradition and identity of the subordinated as foundation and compass. Fanon recognizes the nobility of this antimodern intellectual position but also warns of its pitfalls, in much the same way that he cautions against the dangers of national consciousness, negritude, and pan-Africanism. The risk is that affirming identity and tradition, whether dedicated to past suffering or past glories, creates a static position, even in its opposition to modernity’s domination. The intellectual has to avoid getting stuck in antimodernity and pass through it to a third stage. “Seeking to stick to tradition or reviving neglected traditions is not only going against history, but against one’s people,” Fanon continues. “When a people support an armed or even political struggle against a merciless colonialism, tradition changes meaning.”62 And neither does identity remain fixed, but rather it must be transformed into a revolutionary becoming. The ultimate result of the revolutionary process for Fanon must be the creation of a new humanity, which moves beyond the static opposition between modernity and antimodernity and emerges as a dynamic, creative process. The passage from antimodernity to altermodernity is defined not by opposition but by rupture and transformation.

### AT: Woods Zapatistas Link

#### Their ev concludes that Zapatismo is good and the perm solves – their author and bottom of their card

Tryon Woods, Assistant Prof of Sociology, Anthropology, and Crime & Justice Studies at the University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth, 2007, “The Fact of Anti-Blackness Decolonization in Chiapas and the Niger River,” http://scholarworks.umb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1202&context=humanarchitecture

In conclusion, however, I must take pains to note that this analysis is more a critique of the anti-black world in which these movements arise, than it is an attempt to undercut the Zapatista struggle from the comforts of distance. Although much has been written about them, the Zapatistas are pushing beyond presently documented forms of social organization with a creativity that offers a profoundly radical challenge to the dominant structures that seek to consume humanity. Fully comprehending this process requires being on the ground in the Zapatista communities themselves; I merely offer a deconstruction of the context in which people are struggling to create a new world. In this regard, the unsettling subtext of both the violence in the Niger Delta and the appeal of the Zapatista cause to global civil society is the fact of ongoing black captivity connecting and simultaneously disarticulating the Niger Delta and Chiapas. Anti-globalization, anti-war, anti-neo-liberalism movements and the like will not be successful in creating human emancipation until and unless they choose solidarity with blackness.