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### 1NC T – Quid Pro Quo

#### Economic engagement must be quid-pro-quo

Shinn 96 [James Shinn, C.V. Starr Senior Fellow for Asia at the CFR in New York City and director of the council’s multi-year Asia Project, worked on economic affairs in the East Asia Bureau of the US Dept of State, “Weaving the Net: Conditional Engagement with China,” pp. 9 and 11, google books]

In sum, conditional engagement consists of a set of objectives, a strategy for attaining those objectives, and tactics (specific policies) for implementing that strategy. The objectives of conditional engagement are the ten principles, which were selected to preserve American vital interests in Asia while accommodating China’s emergence as a major power. The overall strategy of conditional engagement follows two parallel lines: economic engagement, to promote the integration of China into the global trading and financial systems; and security engagement, to encourage compliance with the ten principles by diplomatic and military means when economic incentives do not suffice, in order to hedge against the risk of the emergence of a belligerent China. The tactics of economic engagement should promote China’s economic integration through negotiations on trade liberalization, institution building, and educational exchanges. While a carrots-and-sticks approach may be appropriate within the economic arena, the use of trade sanction to achieve short-term political goals is discouraged. The tactics of security engagement should reduce the risks posed by China’s rapid military expansion, its lack of transparency, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and transnational problems such as crime and illegal migration, by engaging in arms control negotiations, multilateral efforts, and a loosely-structured defensive military arrangement in Asia.8 [To footnotes] 8. Conditional engagement’s recommended tactics of tit-for-tat responses are equivalent to using carrots and sticks in response to foreign policy actions by China. Economic engagement calls for what is described as symmetric tit-for-tat and security engagement for asymmetric tit-for-tat. A symmetric response is one that counters a move by China in the same place, time, and manner; an asymmetric response might occur in another place at another time, and perhaps in another manner. A symmetric tit-for-tat would be for Washington to counter a Chinese tariff of 10 percent on imports for the United States with a tariff of 10 percent on imports from China. An asymmetric tit-for-tat would be for the United States to counter a Chines shipment of missiles to Iran with an American shipment of F-16s to Vietnam (John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy. New York: Oxford University Press, (1982). This is also cited in Fareed Zakaria, “The Reagan Strategy of Containment,” Political Science Quarterly 105, no. 3 (1990), pp. 383-88).

#### Violation – the aff unilaterally signs a treaty with Mexico – it’s not quid pro quo

#### Vote negative – LIMITS – there are a near infinite range of “one exception” affs – conditionality forces to find significant deals that Mexico will accept

#### GROUND – unconditional engagement denies us “say no” and backlash arguments which are a crucial part of the engagement debate.

### 1NC Cuba Regional Commitment CP

#### [CP TEXT: The United States federal government ought to offer to <economically engage Cuba by lifting the embargo act> if, and only if, the governments of Brazil, Chile and Mexico agree to commit to actively seeking a naturalization process between the United States and Cuba, and to compelling the Cuban government to work towards establishing representative democracy and better respect for human rights.]

#### Conditioning economic ties on Brazilian, Chilean and Mexican commitment to Cuban democratization solves the case and avoids political backlash – the plan’s unconditional end to the embargo kills Latin American democracy.

Jorge G. Castañeda, 4-21-2009, professor at New York University and fellow at the New America Foundation, was Mexico's foreign minister from 2000 to 2003, “The Right Deal on Cuba,” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB124027198023237151.html>

The question of what to do about the embargo has once again cornered an American president. If President Barack Obama lifts the embargo unilaterally, he will send a message to the Castros and the rest of Latin America that human rights and democracy are not his bailiwick. Furthermore, he lacks the votes in the Senate to do so, unless he obtains an explicit Cuban quid pro quo, which Raúl Castro cannot grant him, especially with his brother back in charge. Conversely, if Mr. Obama limits change to the recently announced freer flow of remittances and family visits to the island, Democrats in the House, Latin American leaders, and the Castros will remain unsatisfied. And if he insists on political change as a precondition for lifting the embargo, Mr. Obama would be pursuing the policy that his last 10 predecessors have fruitlessly followed. There might be a way to square the circle. It begins with a unilateral end to the embargo: Nothing is expected from Cuba. But in exchange for eliminating the embargo, key Latin American players would be expected to commit to actively seeking a normalization process between Washington and Havana, and to forcing Cuba to establish representative democracy and respect for human rights. As democrats who experienced authoritarian rule and sought international support in their struggle against it, leaders like Brazilian President Lula da Silva, Chilean President Michelle Bachelet, and Mexican President Felipe Calderón have been incredibly cynical and irresponsible about Cuba. Mr. Calderón and Ms. Bachelet have forsaken their commitment to democracy and human rights in order to accommodate the left wing. Mr. da Silva, despite having been jailed by the military dictatorship in the early 1980s, has pursued the traditional Brazilian policy of avoiding controversy. By nudging the Latin leaders toward a principled stance, Mr. Obama would turn the tables. This policy would give the Cubans what they say they want: an unconditional end to the embargo, the beginning of a negotiation process, and perhaps even access to international financial institutions' funds. The Latin American leaders would get a major concession from the new administration on a highly symbolic issue. And human-rights defenders in Latin America and elsewhere would see their concerns regarding free elections, freedom of the press, freedom of association, and the liberation of political prisoners addressed as a demand from Cuba's friends -- not as an imposition from Washington. Mr. Obama would look great, since U.S. policy would shift in exchange for Latin leaders' dedication to principles like democracy and human rights that he and they espouse. A clear commitment from Latin leaders to a normalization that would not follow the Vietnamese course (economic reform with no political change) would be a major foreign policy victory for Mr. Obama.

#### Latin America-led push for hemispheric democracy is critical for global democracy – Cuba’s a key starting point.

Carl Gershman, 10-12-2012, President, the National Endowment for Democracy, Address in the Congress of the Republic of Peru, “Latin America and the Worldwide Movement for Democracy,” <http://www.ned.org/about/board/meet-our-president/archived-presentations-and-articles/latin-america-and-the-worldwide-m>

I believe that the defense of democracy in Latin America must come from within. It needs the effective support of the United States, of course. But the lead must come from within Latin America, and for that there must be a clear and consistent Latin American voice for the defense of democracy in the hemisphere. Peru can be that voice, and it can help mobilize others in Latin America to defend and support democracy. It has the legitimacy to do this, and it has the experience, given its own long struggle for democracy, especially its effort to achieve political and economic inclusion of the poor and it success in achieving reconciliation after violent conflict. So let us build a new partnership for democracy in the hemisphere, a partnership of democracies. In holding its Seventh Assembly in Peru, the World Movement for Democracy is making a statement that what happens in Peru is important for democracy in Latin America, and that the steady but uncertain democratic progress in Latin America has important meaning for the future of democracy in the world. The struggles for democracy that have occurred in this hemisphere were not isolated events. They were, as Professor Huntington said, part of a global wave, drawing influence from earlier democratic struggles and from developments in other regions, and in turn influencing events taking place elsewhere and at a later time. Moreover, this process was not just the unfolding of objective forces but involved real people with ideas, aspirations, and a sense of their own dignity. While assuming responsibility for their own fate, they also asked for and expected the solidarity of others in their own country and beyond, especially those fortunate enough to enjoy the benefits of human freedom. Peru can and, I think, should give that kind of solidarity. It can give it to the troubled countries of Central America, as well as to people who are fighting for democracy in Cuba and Venezuela and in the neighboring countries of Ecuador and Bolivia.

#### Democracy solves extinction.

Larry Diamond, 1995, senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, December 1995, Promoting Democracy in the 1990s, http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/1.htm

OTHER THREATS This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

### 1NC – K

#### The guise of economic engagement is another card in the deck of empire building – expanding contact with Cuba is just another tactic to expand the empire

James Petras, Bartle Professor (Emeritus) of Sociology at Binghamton University, New York, 12-30-11, “Imperialism and the “Anti-Imperialism of the Fools,”
 <http://petras.lahaine.org/?p=1886>

There is a long history of imperialist “anti-imperialism”, officially sponsored condemnation, exposés and moral indignation directed exclusively against rival imperialists, emerging powers or simply competitors, who in some cases are simply following in the footsteps of the established imperial powers. English imperialists in their heyday justified their world-wide plunder of three continents by perpetuating the “Black Legend”, of Spanish empire’s “exceptional cruelty” toward indigenous people of Latin America, while engaging in the biggest and most lucrative African slave trade. While the Spanish colonists enslaved the indigenous people, the Anglo-american settlers exterminated [indigenous people]….. In the run-up to World War II, European and US imperial powers, while exploiting their Asian colonies condemned Japanese imperial powers’ invasion and colonization of China. Japan, in turn claimed it was leading Asia’s forces fighting against Western imperialism and projected a post-colonial “co-prosperity” sphere of equal Asian partners. The imperialist use of “anti-imperialist” moral rhetoric was designed to weaken rivals and was directed to several audiences. In fact, at no point did the anti-imperialist rhetoric serve to “liberate” any of the colonized people. In almost all cases the victorious imperial power only substituted one form colonial or neo-colonial rule for another. The “anti-imperialism” of the imperialists is directed at the nationalist movements of the colonized countries and at their domestic public. British imperialists fomented uprisings among the agro-mining elites in Latin America promising “free trade” against Spanish mercantilist rule ;they backed the “self-determination” of the slaveholding cotton plantation owners in the US South against the Union;they supported the territorial claims of the Iroquois tribal leaders against the US anti-colonial revolutionaries … exploiting legitimate grievances for imperial ends. During World War II, the Japanese imperialists supported a sector of the nationalist anti-colonial movement in India against the British Empire. The US condemned Spanish colonial rule in Cuba and the Philippines and went to war to “liberate” the oppressed peoples from tyranny….and remained to impose a reign of terror, exploitation and colonial rule… The imperial powers sought to divide the anti-colonial movements and create future “client rulers” when and if they succeeded. The use of anti-imperialist rhetoric was designed to attract two sets of groups. A conservative group with common political and economic interests with the imperial power, which shared their hostility to revolutionary nationalists and which sought to accrue greater advantage by tying their fortunes to a rising imperial power. A radical sector of the movement tactically allied itself with the rising imperial power, with the idea of using the imperial power to secure resources (arms, propaganda, vehicles and financial aid) and, once securing power, to discard them. More often than not, in this game of mutual manipulation between empire and nationalists, the former won out … as is the case then and now. The imperialist “anti-imperialist” rhetoric was equally directed at the domestic public, especially in countries like the US which prized its 18th anti-colonial heritage. The purpose was to broaden the base of empire building beyond the hard line empire loyalists, militarists and corporate beneficiaries. Their appeal sought to include liberals, humanitarians, progressive intellectuals, religious and secular moralists and other “opinion-makers” who had a certain cachet with thelarger public, the ones who would have to pay with their lives and tax money for the inter-imperial and colonial wars. The official spokespeople of empire publicize real and fabricated atrocities of their imperial rivals, and highlight the plight of the colonized victims. The corporate elite and the hardline militarists demand military action to protect property, or to seize strategic resources; the humanitarians and progressives denounce the “crimes against humanity” and echo the calls “to do something concrete” to save the victims from genocide. Sectors of the Left join the chorus, finding a sector of victims who fit in with their abstract ideology, and plead for the imperial powers to “arm the people to liberate themselves” (sic). By lending moral support and a veneer of respectability to the imperial war, by swallowing the propaganda of “war to save victims” the progressives become the prototype of the “anti-imperialism of the fools”. Having secured broad public support on the bases of “anti-imperialism”, the imperialist powers feel free to sacrifice citizens’ lives and the public treasury ,to pursue war, fueled by the moral fervor of a righteous cause. As the butchery drags on and the casualties mount, and the public wearies of war and its cost, progressive and leftist enthusiasm turns to silence or worse, moral hypocrisy with claims that “the nature of the war changed” or “that this isn’t the kind of war that we had in mind …”. As if the war makers ever intended to consult the progressives and left on how and why they should engage in imperial wars.! In the contemporary period the imperial “anti-imperialist wars” and aggression have been greatly aided and abetted by well-funded “grass roots” so-called “non-governmental organizations” which act to mobilize popular movements which can “invite” imperial aggression. Over the past four decades US imperialism has fomented at least two dozen “grass roots” movements which have destroyed democratic governments, or decimated collectivist welfare states or provoked major damage to the economy of targeted countries. In Chile throughout 1972-73 under the democratically elected government of Salvador Allende, the CIA financed and provided major support – via the AFL-CIO–to private truck owners to paralyze the flow of goods and services .They also funded a strike by a sector of the copper workers union (at the El Tenient mine) to undermine copper production and exports, in the lead up to the coup. After the military took power several “grass roots” Christian Democratic union officials participated in the purge of elected leftist union activists. Needless to say in short order the truck owners and copper workers ended the strike, dropped their demands and subsequently lost all bargaining rights! In the 1980’s the CIA via Vatican channels transferred millions of dollars to sustain the “Solidarity Union” in Poland, making a hero of the Gdansk shipyards worker-leader Lech Walesa, who spearheaded the general strike to topple the Communist regime. With the overthrow of Communism so also went guaranteed employment, social security and trade union militancy: the neo-liberal regimes reduced the workforce at Gdansk by fifty percent and eventually closed it, giving the boot to the entire workforce.. Walesa retired with a magnificent Presidential pension, while his former workmates walked the streets and the new “independent” Polish rulers provided NATO with military bases and mercenaries for imperial wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. In 2002 the White House, the CIA , the AFL-CIO and NGOs, backed a Venezuelan military-business – trade union bureaucrat led “grass roots” coup that overthrew democratically elected President Chavez. In 48 hours a million strong authentic grass roots mobilization of the urban poor backed by constitutionalist military forces defeated the US backed dictators and restored Chavez to power .Subsequently oil executives directed a lockout backed by several US financed NGOs. They were defeated by the workers’ takeover of the oil industry. The unsuccessful coup and lockout cost the Venezuelan economy billions of dollars in lost income and caused a double digit decline in GNP. The US backed “grass roots” armed jihadists to liberated “Bosnia” and armed the“grass roots” terrorist Kosova Liberation Army to break-up Yugoslavia.Almost the entire Western Left cheered as, the US bombed Belgrade, degraded the economy and claimed it was “responding to genocide”. Kosova “free and independent” became a huge market for white slavers, housed the biggest US military base in Europe, with the highest per-capita out migration of any country in Europe. The imperial “grass roots” strategy combines humanitarian, democratic and anti-imperialist rhetoric and paid and trained local NGO’s, with mass media blitzes to mobilize Western public opinion and especially “prestigious leftist moral critics” behind their power grabs. The Consequence of Imperial Promoted “Anti-Imperialist” Movements: Who Wins and Who Loses? The historic record of imperialist promoted “anti-imperialist” and “pro-democracy” “grass roots movements” is uniformly negative. Let us briefly summarize the results. In Chile ‘grass roots’ truck owners strike led to the brutal military dictatorship of Augusto Pinochet and nearly two decades of torture, murder, jailing and forced exile of hundreds of thousands, the imposition of brutal “free market policies” and subordination to US imperial policies. In summary the US multi-national copper corporations and the Chilean oligarchy were the big winners and the mass of the working class and urban and rural poor the biggest losers. The US backed “grass roots uprisings” in Eastern Europe against Soviet domination, exchanged Russian for US domination; subordination to NATO instead of the Warsaw Pact; the massive transfer of national public enterprises, banks and media to Western multi-nationals. Privatization of national enterprises led to unprecedented levels of double-digit unemployment, skyrocketing rents and the growth of pensioner poverty.The crises induced the flight of millions of the most educated and skilled workers and the elimination of free public health, higher education and worker vacation resorts. Throughout the now capitalist Eastern Europe and USSR highly organized criminal gangs developed large scale prostitution and drug rings; foreign and local gangster ‘entrepeneurs’ seized lucrative public enterprises and formed a new class of super-rich oligarchs Electoral party politicians, local business people and professionals linked to Western ‘partners’ were the socio-economic winners. Pensioners, workers, collective farmers, the unemployed youth were the big losers along with the formerly subsidized cultural artists. Military bases in Eastern Europe became the empire’s first line of military attack of Russia and the target of any counter-attack. If we measure the consequences of the shift in imperial power, it is clear that the Eastern Europe countries have become even more subservient under the US and the EU than under Russia. Western induced financial crises have devastated their economies; Eastern European troops have served in more imperial wars under NATO than under Soviet rule; the cultural media are under Western commercial control. Most of all, the degree of imperial control over all economic sectors far exceeds anything that existed under the Soviets. The Eastern European ‘grass roots’ movement succeeded in deepening and extending the US Empire; the advocates of peace, social justice, national independence, a cultural renaissance and social welfare with democracy were the big losers. Western liberals, progressives and leftists who fell in love with imperialist promoted “anti-imperialism” are also big losers. Their support for the NATO attack on Yugoslavia led to the break-up of a multi-national state and the creation of huge NATO military bases and a white slavers paradise in Kosova. Their blind support for the imperial promoted “liberation” of Eastern Europe devastated the welfare state, eliminating the pressure on Western regimes’ need to compete in providing welfare provisions. The main beneficiaries of Western imperial advances via ‘grass roots’ uprisings were the multi-national corporations, the Pentagon and the rightwing free market neo-liberals. As the entire political spectrum moved to the right a sector of the left and progressives eventually jumped on the bandwagon. The Left moralists lost credibility and support, their peace movements dwindled, their “moral critiques” lost resonance. The left and progressives who tail-ended the imperial backed “grass roots movements”, whether in the name of “anti-stalinism”, “pro-democracy” or “anti-imperialism” have never engaged in any critical reflection; no effort to analyze the long-term negative consequences of their positions in terms of the losses in social welfare, national independence or personal dignity. The long history of imperialist manipulation of “anti-imperialist” narratives has found virulent expression in the present day. The New Cold War launched by Obama against China and Russia, the hot war brewing in the Gulf over Iran’s alleged military threat, the interventionist threat against Venezuela’s “drug-networks”,and Syria’s “bloodbath” are part and parcel of the use and abuse of “anti-imperialism” to prop up a declining empire. Hopefully, the progressive and leftist writers and scribes will learn from the ideological pitfalls of the past and resist the temptation to access the mass media by providing a ‘progressive cover’ to imperial dubbed “rebels”. It is time to distinguish between genuine anti-imperialism and pro-democracy movements and those promoted by Washington, NATO and the mass media.

#### The Cuba embargo is the factor preventing U.S. economic domination of the region.

William M. Leogrande, and Julie M. Thomas, 2002 (Professor of Government in the School of Public Affairs @ American University, and Participant in a Ph.D. Dissertation at the School of Public Affair @ American University, “Cuba’s Quest for Economic Interdependence”, Journal of Latin American Studies, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp. 325-363; JSTOR :)

If there is one bright spot in the current landscape of Cuba's economic travails, it is the fact that Cuba has not (yet) fallen back into a dependent economic relationship with the United States. That, of course, is because of the US economic embargo - a politically motivated sanction that ironically has become the principal bulwark against US economic domination of post-Cold War Cuba. No doubt the embargo hinders Cuban economic growth by preventing US direct foreign investment on the island, by discouraging investment from other sources, and by increasing Cuban transportation costs for things it must sell farther from home. In the absence of the embargo, there is little doubt that trade with the United States would quickly grow to dwarf trade with every other trade partner, tourists from the United States would dwarf the numbers from Canada and western Europe, and investment from US firms (including Cuban-American firms) would dwarf investments from elsewhere.

#### The affirmative relies on the government for solutions – this creates an illusion that we are making progressive action. Reform will inevitably lead to the further retrenchment of racism. Independently, this colonizes our education in the debate sphere – prior impact

**Woan** (Master of Arts in Philosophy, Politics, and Law in the Graduate School of Binghamton University) 20**11**

(Tansy, “The value of resistance in a permanently white, civil society,” <http://gradworks.umi.com/14/96/1496586.html>, August 2011, pg 9-19)

Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton, in then influential Black Power, describe reformist strategies as "playing ball" with the white man. They argue that reform plays the white man's game in order to gain rights, i.e. appeal to a white supremacist government that is the precise agent responsible for the original harms they are seeking to alleviate.9 While this may very well result in the granting of new rights previously denied, it maintains a hierarchical system between whites and nonwhites, since the latter will have to continue to appeal to the former to ask for rights they never should have been denied in the first place. This places the former in a position of power to accept or deny such requests. Thus, in Carmichael and Hamilton's view, **attempting to resist white supremacy by working within white supremacist institutions maintains a dangerous system of power relations that lock in place the hierarchy between whites and nonwhites**. / It is unfortunate enough that members of minority groups face public and private racial discrimination. It is worse, however, to place the burden of combating this discrimination on them. What Carmichael and Hamilton aptly point out is that the hierarchy between races mentioned above is what is responsible for this undue burden. There is not only the constant physical struggle of protesting, writing letters, and being dragged through litigation that can often get expensive, but there is the psychological struggle as well. Why am I not worthy of equal protection under the law? Why is it that others do not even notice the disparate impact of the law? Or, even worse, why is it that those who do notice, seem to not care? / What inevitably comes with these types of reformist strategies is an emotional struggle, namely, an inferiority complex that makes the victimized individual stop and wonder — who put the white man in charge of my body? Appeals to the federal government to repeal discriminatory acts that deny minorities rights becomes analogous to asking whites to eliminate such policies and to allow others access to the same rights they enjoy every day. The racial state becomes in charge of what nonwhites can and cannot do, and when nonwhites continue to go to whites asking them to pass certain policies, nonwhites further legitimate this system of power relations. It is difficult to see how true equality can be achieved wider such a system. / B. Missing the Root Cause: The Racial State / Omi and Winant further support this claim and explain that it is not merely individual policies passed by the United States federal government that are racist, but that racial oppression is a structure of the government itself.10 They describe this structure as the "racial state" to show that the state does not merely support racism, but rather, it supports the concept of race itself. As will be discussed later in this paper, Omi and Winant explain how the state is the agent that has defined race, and that this definition has evolved over time, to maintain the concept of race and support racism. / Given the existence of the racial state, **Omi and Winant critique reformist strategies as falling short of achieving normative goals of eliminating racism since the reforms merely get re-equilibriated**. A look at the history of racial victories in the United States further supports this critique. Racial victories for one minority were often made possible only with the entrapment of another racial minority. For example, while many celebrate the racial victory of the 1954 Brown v. Board decision, many fail to see this happened the same year as Operation Wetback, which shifted the racial discrimination to a different population, removing close to one million illegal immigrants, mostly Mexicans, from the United States.11 Moreover, soon after the ratification of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments granting citizenship and suffrage to Blacks. Congress chose to deny citizenship to Chinese immigrants.12 In 1941, shortly after the establishment of the Committee on Fair Employment Practices permitted Blacks into defense industries, Japanese Americans were taken from their homes and sent off to internment camps. Pei-te Lien argues that all of these "coincidences" support critiques of reformist strategies that merely target individual policies, since without challenging the racial state as a whole, even the **elimination of these individual policies will fail to eliminate racism, as they will simply replicate themselves or shift elsewhere and target racial minorities in different ways**.14 / C. Separatist Movements / This helps to explain why political activists began adopting other more revolutionary strategies. Contrary to Martin Luther King Jr. and many of his followers during the Civil Rights Movement, the Black Power Movement emerged and began advocating for more separatist strategies that rejected making reformist appeals to the United States federal government. In his speech "The Ballot or the Bullet," Malcolm X argued: / When you take your case to Washington D.C., you're taking it to the criminal who's responsible: it's like miming from the wolf to the fox. They're all in cahoots together. They all work political chicanery and make you look like a chump before the eyes of the world. Here you are walking around in America, getting ready to be drafted and sent abroad, like a tin soldier, and when you get over there, people ask you what you are fighting for, and you have to stick your tongue in your cheek. No, take Uncle Sam to court, take him before the world. / Critics of reformist strategies, such as Malcolm X, understood the United States as being inherently racial and thus incapable of reform. They use the "coincidences" listed above as evidence to support this claim. They view the United States federal government as a racial state that will merely continue to define race in new and more modernized ways, ensuring the permanence of racism with the passage of new policies supporting these definitions. This is why they believe reformists are wrong to attack individual policies, rather than the racial state itself. / For example, the legal enforcement of a racially discriminatory housing covenant may have been justified due to a racist belief that members of the minority race restricted from acquiring title within that neighborhood is inferior to the Caucasian race. More specifically, one might support said covenant because one believes the inferiority of that minority race and the potential they might become your neighbor will result in a decrease in the fair market value of your property. After vigorous ongoing protests from civil rights activists, that particular law enforcing those covenants might get repealed. However, the reason for the repeal of that law might arise not from an ethical epiphany, but rather an economic rationale in which the homeowner is shown his property value will remain unaffected, or perhaps even increase. Thus, that particular act may get repealed, but the policymakers responsible for its original draft will still be in power, and will maintain the same beliefs that motivated that piece of legislation in the first place. Because there has been no ethical realization of the injustice in their conduct, the chances remain high that they will construct new, apparently different but equally discriminatory policies that will force activists to join forces once again and continue the same fight. / This is why it is not the individual policies, but the government itself that is the "preeminent site of racial conflict."17 Omi and Winant's proposal of the "racial state" views the government as "inherently racial," meaning it does not simply intervene in racial conflicts, but it is the locus of racial conflict.18 In addition to structuring conceptions of race, the government in the United States is in and of itself racially structured.19 State policies govern racial politics, heavily influencing the public on how race should be viewed. The ways in which it does so changes over time, often taking on a more invisible nature. For example, Omi and Winant describe the racial state as treating race in different ways throughout different periods of time, first as a biologically based essence, and then as an ideology, etc. These policies are followed by racial remedies offered by government institutions, in response to political pressures and in accordance to these different treatments of race, varying in degree depending on the magnitude of the threats those pressures pose to the order of society. Notable achievements during the Civil Rights Movement have served as a double-edged sword. While the reformist strategies utilized during that period helped make certain advances possible, it also drove other more overt expressions of racism underground. These more invisible instantiations of racial injustice are far more difficult to identify than its previously more explicit forms. **Praising these victories risks giving off the illusion that the fight is over and that racism is a description of the past**. / For example, the ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment gave off the illusion that all citizens thereafter had equal access to the right to vote. Those who supported its ratification now felt entitled to the moral credentials necessary to legitimize their ability to express racially prejudiced attitudes.21 For example, voter turnout today remains relatively low for Asian-Americans, and many blame this on cultural differences between Asians and Americans.22 Asian-Americans are labeled as apathetic in the political community and they themselves have been attributed the blame for relatively low representation of Asian-Americans in the government today.23 This however, ignores the way in which other more invisible practices serve to obstruct Asian-Americans from being able to exercise their right to vote. / Research by the United States Election Assistance Commission by the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University, for example, indicates that restrictive voter identification requirements have effectively served to disenfranchise Asian Pacific Islanders (APIs) from voting.24 In the 2004 election, researchers found APIs in states where voters were required to present proper identification at the polls were 8.5% less likely to vote.25 This study confirmed that voter ID requirements prevented a large number of APIs from voting.26 / Voter suppression tactics also play a large role in the disenfranchisement of APIs. According to a Voter Intimidation and Vote Suppression briefing paper by Demos, a national public policy center, an estimated 50 Asian Americans were selectively challenged at the polls in Alabama during August of 2004, as being ineligible to vote due to insufficient English-speaking skills.27 Many states have allowed this selective challenging of voters to take place at the polls, resulting in a feeling of fear, intimidation, and embarrassment among APIs, driving them away from the polls. / The danger in treasuring monumental victories such as the ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment becomes apparent when people interpret this ratification as an indication that voting discrimination is no longer a problem, and that if the voter turnout of Asian-Americans is consistently low, it must be because they are politically apathetic or disinterested in American ideals. Because they originally supported the ratification of the amendment, whites can now feel as if they have the moral credentials to make conclusions such as the cultural differences rationale. The same can be seen after courts ordered the desegregation of public schools and after affirmative action programs became more widespread. People began assuming African-Americans now had an equal opportunity for education and that if they did not succeed, it must be a reflection of their intelligence or work-ethic, failing to see the ways the problem has not been solved, but rather disguised itself in other costumes, such as tracking programs in schools or teachers who view their presence as merely "affirmative action babies" and expect them to fail. / **One might ask, then, why can we not change the racial state one policy at a time?** Perhaps one could first work to gain the right to vote, and then move on to combat discriminatory identification requirements and political scare tactics. It would not seem entirely implausible to assume that the success of individual piecemeal reforms within the government could eventually result in a transformation of the institution itself. However, simply eliminating discriminatory policies is insufficient for an overhaul of a racial institution. / Understanding the motivating reasons for the elimination of individual racist policies is a critical factor in determining the success of a movement. While one justification for passing the Fifteenth Amendment might consist of arguments in favor of equality and exposing racial injustice, another justification might involve maintaining order and minimizing disruption, which is important to the federal government and its ability to run smoothly. Thus, the government often seeks out ways to normalize society through eliminating disruptions to preserve order. When those being denied certain rights grow significantly discontent, they rebel and become disruptions to the functioning of white, civil society. This can take the form of civil disobedience, such as protests, peaceful demonstrations, petitions, letters to the government, etc., or more revolutionary measures, such as damaging government offices or violently harassing officials to acknowledge the injustices and change policy. / All of these measures, however peaceful or violent, disrupt society. A town cannot run smoothly if protesters are filling up the streets or blocking frequently-used road paths, and most certainly cannot run smoothly if town halls are being lit on fire. Thus, in order to return to the desired homeostasis, those in power may often compromise and offer to rectify the situation at hand by granting rights to individuals through changes in legislation in order to appease them and "eliminate" the disruption (the protests, demonstrations, etc.). The lack of effort made towards protecting these rights bolsters Bell's argument that these reforms serve more of a symbolic value rather than functional. If still operating under the racial state, these piecemeal reforms will fail to solve the original racial injustices in the long term, as they will only succeed in establishing a new unstable equilibrium, only to be followed with the replication of new racial problems.28 These new problems will once again create resentment, generate protest, and the cycle will begin to replicate itself, ensuring the permanence of racism. Omi and Winant term this cycle of continuous disruption and restoration of order as the trajectory of racial politics.29 This trajectory supports the treatment of racism as inevitable since even if the racial state mitigates racial disruption over a particular policy and "restores order," another policy based off a new definition of race will emerge triggering another racial disruption, continuing this cycle of racial politics.

#### Thus the alternative – reject the affirmative as U.S. imperialism. Only an ethics of refusal can challenge power structures.

Steve Martinot, 2005 (Adjunct Professor @ San Francisco State University, “Pro-Democracy and the Ethics of Refusal”, Socialism and Democracy, Vol. 19, No. 2 :)

In a system in which humans have been rendered secondary or irrelevant, a different ethics, which refuses the system of corruption as a system, a social structure, rather than simply point out the empirical appearance of corruption in government or political events, must ground our thinking. Neither political program nor organizational strategies, to the extent they continue to address themselves to this system as valid, are relevant to such a necessity. The terms of the two-party system, the corporate media, the system of representationism, and the congressional culture of "horsetrading" must be refused. That means that realigning the Democratic Party, trying to use the corporate media to get a democratic message out, organizing third parties as alternates to the two major parties in electoral processes, using electoral campaigns themselves, writing to Congress, demonstrating to make demands on the government, are all modes of simply addressing the government, and telling it and the corporate structure that we are firmly in place within their political culture of corruption. A counter-ethics can only be an ethics of refusal. An ethic of refusal can be exemplified thus: suppose someone lies to you every day, and he says something today; if you believe what he says today, then you are a total and utter fool. Insofar as the corporate media, the government, and all officials in the two-party system lie to us daily, while suppressing necessary information, there is nothing they say that should be believed (unless proven beyond all doubt, to the satisfaction of every skeptical question, in open public discussion, however long that takes). Insofar as these structures and institutions have shown themselves to be corrupt, there is nothing that they do that should not be considered corrupt, and rejected as invalid or illegitimate. Nothing the government does, domestically or in foreign policy, should be supported unless its reasons are submitted to open discussion and binding referendum. The ethics of refusal (the refusal, in advance, of everything the government, the corporations, or the media say or do) is square one. It is the first step toward liberation from the assumptions that these corrupt institutions can be realigned. It is the first step toward voiding support for what has impoverished us and rendered us irrelevant. It is the first step toward bringing those institutions to a halt. The time is long past when we can go to the government or the political parties with demands for information or policy. We have to satisfy those demands for ourselves by creating an alternate political structure with which to do so. This means to replace the ethics of going to the government, and thus granting it credence, with the establishment of a citizenship in autonomy whose job is to pull more and more people away from support for the government. The greatest betrayal of the ABB movement in the last election, in acceding to the meta-corruption of the two-party system, and assisting in shutting down the political space, lay in giving up its independence and autonomy. Democracy is now the name for an alternate political structure; and a pro-democracy movement is the name for enacting the ethic of refusal. If democracy is based on information, participation, and transparent honesty of political operations, policymaking, and elections, then alternate sources for these must be constructed and supported: alternate media and alternate sources of information; alternate networking of ideas; the construction of local political spaces in which to speak to ourselves, and not to a corrupt system; the use of political space to construct alternate organizations that make policy democratically, and are directed by the people who make it; the construction of health services, education and schooling, and community policing; an ethic of local community attention to crime and trouble that is restorative and not revenge-oriented; the organization of elections that the people sanction, though the corrupt power structure does not. Such an alternate political structure can only ground itself on an ethics of refusal, refusing all attempts of the government to control it. An alternate political culture must refuse to grant recognition or credence to the two-party system, to the structures of governance and information, and to the mythology of meta-corruption that still says those structures have legitimacy. This does not mean that actions should not be organized to directly confront the government, or the elite, and try to stop their fraud, their crimes and injustices. The ethic of refusal should not be construed as contradicting or obstructing direct action, nor those for whom direct action is desirable and feasible. But the relation (or non-relation) of direct action to alternate political structures needs to be understood; the relation of complicity between direct action's focus on power and the terms of institutional power needs to be understood. To contest governance in its own terms will only reaffirm the existence and operation of its power, and embed itself in its institutionity. The ethics of refusal makes its first principle standing outside the corruption of those social institutions; it is the principle of building outside the structures of corruption, and building and building, until the alternative becomes the inside, and the corrupt institutions are the outside. A pro-democracy movement, in its autonomy, can still insist on existing governments (city and state) fulfilling their responsibility to maintain the infrastructure: roads, buildings, utilities, water, garbage collection, etc. It is a separation between the source of policymaking and the administration of the infrastructure that pro-democracy makes feasible. For centuries, taxes have been paid, while government has focused on meeting corporate and military interests in the name of profitability (remember the public transportation boondoggle). If policy is relocated to the people, democratically, at the level of neighborhoods, cities, agrarian areas, in economic production and for local services, then that is where direction and control of the infrastructure must come from. This will take a long time to build. It will require dialogue rather than blueprint, between people, between neighborhoods, between towns, building itself through popular discussions and councils. But now is the time to start, when the profundity of the corruption has become so overt that there is nowhere else to turn.

### Case

#### This flips all their education arguments – regardless of how they articulate their micro-level demand, their discourse is inexorably tied with the macro structures of whiteness.

Pierre Schlag, Professor of Law @ the University of Colorado, 1990, “Normative and Nowhere to Go,” Lexis-Nexis

All of this can seem very funny. That's because it is very funny. It is also deadly serious. It is deadly serious, because all this normative legal thought, as Robert Cover explained, takes place in a field of pain and death. n56 And in a very real sense Cover was right. Yet as it takes place, normative legal thought is playing language games -- utterly oblivious to the character of the language games it plays, and thus, utterly uninterested in considering its own rhetorical and political contributions (or lack thereof) to the field of pain and death. To be sure, normative legal thinkers are often genuinely concerned with reducing the pain and the death. However, the problem is not what normative legal thinkers do with normative legal thought, but what normative legal thought does with normative legal thinkers. What is missing in normative legal thought is any serious questioning, let alone tracing, of the relations that the practice, the rhetoric, the routine of normative legal thought have (or do not have) to the field of pain and death. / And there is a reason for that: Normative legal thought misunderstands its own situation. Typically, normative legal thought understands itself to be outside the field of pain and death and in charge of organizing and policing that field. It is as if the action of normative legal thought could be separated from the background field of pain and death. This theatrical distinction is what allows normative legal thought its own self-important, self-righteous, self-image -- its congratulatory sense of its own accomplishments and effectiveness. / All this self-congratulation works very nicely so long as normative legal [\*188] thought continues to imagine itself as outside the field of pain and death and as having effects within that field. n57 Yet it is doubtful this image can be maintained. It is not so much the case that normative legal thought has effects on the field of pain and death -- at least not in the direct, originary way it imagines. Rather, it is more the case that normative legal thought is the pattern, is the operation of the bureaucratic distribution and the institutional allocation of the pain and the death. n58 And apart from the leftover ego-centered rationalist rhetoric of the eighteenth century (and our routine), there is nothing at this point to suggest that we, as legal thinkers, are in control of normative legal thought. / The problem for us, as legal thinkers, is that the normative appeal of normative legal thought systematically turns us away from recognizing that normative legal thought is grounded on an utterly unbelievable re-presentation of the field it claims to describe and regulate. The problem for us is that normative legal thought, rather than assisting in the understanding of present political and moral situations, stands in the way. It systematically reinscribes its own aesthetic -- its own fantastic understanding of the political and moral scene. n59 Until normative legal thought begins to deal with its own paradoxical postmodern rhetorical situation, it will remain something of an irresponsible enterprise. In its rhetorical structure, it will continue to populate the legal academic world with individual humanist subjects who think themselves empowered Cartesian egos, but who are largely the manipulated constructions of bureaucratic practices -- academic and otherwise. / To the extent possible, it is important to avoid this kind of category mistake. For instance, it is important to understand that your automobile insurance adjuster is not simply some updated version of the eighteenth century \*189 individual humanist subject. Even though the insurance adjuster will quite often engage you in normative talk-- arguing with you about responsibility, fairness, fault, allocation of blame, adequacy of compensation, and the like-- he is unlikely to be terribly receptive or susceptible to any authentic normative dialogue. His normative competence, his normative sensitivity, is scripted somewhere else. It is important to be clear about these things. The contemporary lawyer, for instance, may talk the normative rhetoric of the eighteenth century individual humanist subject. But make no mistake: This normative or humanist rhetoric is very likely the unfolding of bureaucratic logic. The modern lawyer is very often a kind of meta-insurance adjuster. And that makes you and me, as legal academics, trainers of meta-insurance adjusters. This is perhaps an unpleasant realization. One of the most important effects of normative legal thought is to intercede here so that we, as legal academics, do not have to confront this unpleasant realization. Normative legal thought allows us to pretend that we are preparing our students to become Atticus Finch [FN61] while we are in fact training people who will enter the meta-insurance adjustment business. For our students, this role-confusion is unlikely to be very funny. It will get even less so upon their graduation -- when they learn that Atticus Finch has been written out of the script. For us, of course, it is a pleasant fantasy to think we are teaching Atticus Finch. When the fantasy is over, it becomes one hell of a category mistake. And in the rude transition from the one to the other, Atticus Finch can quickly turn into Dan Quayle. In fact, if you train your students to become Atticus Finch, they will likely end up as Dan Quayle – cognitively defenseless against the regimenting and monitoring practices of bureaucratic institutions. Atticus Finch, as admirable as he may be, has none of the cognitive or critical resources necessary to understand the duplicities of the bureaucratic networks within which we operate. Apart from the fantasies of the legal academy, there is no longer a place in America for a lawyer like Atticus Finch. There is nothing for him to do here -- nothing he can do. He is a moral character in a world where the role of moral thought has become at best highly ambivalent, a normative thinker in a world where normative legal thought is already largely the bureaucratic logic of institutions.

#### The aff’s symbolic gesture strengthens destructive right-wing populist politics---

Ingar Solty 12, Politics Editor of Das Argument, and co-founder and Board member of the North-Atlantic Left Dialogue (NALD), an annual summit of left intellectuals organized by the Rosa Luxemburg Foundation and funded by the German Foreign Office, 2012, “After neoliberalism: left versus right projects of leadership in the global crisis,” in Global Crises and the Crisis of Global Leadership, ed. Gill, p. 205-208

The immediate empirical fallout of the neoliberalization of social democracy was quite obvious. The consequences could be seen in the erosion of the middle classes, the shrinking of the public sector for skilled workers and the expansion of low-wage sectors, especially in countries such as Germany, which, as a result of the lack of a national minimum wage, low strike levels and the dependence of the average wage level on national bargaining coverage, as well as far-reaching employment security (Ku¨ndigungsschutz), were transformed into low-wage economies in very short periods of time. This all found its empirical reflection in the many studies that showed the growing social inequality within the global North and the rapid return of poverty, especially among single mothers and their children. However, these material developments were accompanied by the spread of a deep-seated sense of social insecurity, often independent of actual income levels, that had to result in political change. Erosion of social democracy and conservatism and growing right-wing populism Hegemonic theory is challenged by the fact that these social structural developments did not articulate themselves in an identical fashion, either among individuals or groups, despite the fact that the experiences were the same across countries. Nonetheless, a representation crisis was accelerated during the social democratic era of neoliberalism when it became clear that social democratic parties and conservative/Christian democratic parties alike had little to offer to the respective segments of the population that had been their traditional voters. This even included the United States, in which the Democratic Party had never been a class party in the European sense but, rather, had assumed quasi-socialdemocratic functions during the New Deal era while remaining to a large degree a classical liberal party. Thus, the trend towards voter abstention, or, to speak in terms of political sociology, the declining integrative potentials of political (cross-class) parties, was characterized by a clear class nature and a growing disenfranchising of the working-class segment of society, as well as of some parts of the eroding and less secure middle classes. This also meant that neoliberal attempts to portray abstention as a reflection not of people’s dissatisfaction but, rather, of (passive) consent were doomed to fail. However, this representation crisis was flanked by the rise of rightwing populism, both in terms of right-wing parties attracting protest votes from the radicalized middle classes and some parts of the alienated working class and in terms of deep-seated authoritarian reactions to the social restructuring under neoliberalism (Bischoff, Do¨ rre and Gauthier 2004). Thus, not only did this right-wing populism form the backbone of any right-wing project, but it also poisoned the political situation in so far as, where it emerged, it shifted the political climate markedly to the right, and was partly responsible for new social democratic campaigns for workfare regimes and the increased flexibility of labour markets throughout the global North. It is absolutely correct to define right-wing populism as a petty bourgeois or (private sector) middle-class movement. The authoritarianism of the achiever ideology (Leistungsideologie) characteristic of right-wing populism (secular or religious) resonates among the radicalized middle classes. The middle classes experience capitalist competition in the most economically individualized manner; they feel squeezed between, on the one hand, the bourgeoisie and big business and, on the other, the working class. Many of them, such as members of the scientific and technical intelligentsia, as well as people in lower and middle management, are economically, culturally and socially oriented towards and aspire to the top of society. Partly in response to their socialization and partly in response to the experience of struggles connected to the need to succeed amid conditions of cut-throat competition, they tend to develop a habitus, in Pierre Bourdieu’s sense of the term, that seeks to distinguish – or is supposed to distinguish – themselves from the working class ‘rabble’. Furthermore, often, and especially during economic crises, they display the particular type of authoritarianism that the Frankfurt School analysed so well (recall the Studies in Prejudice and Theodor Adorno’s description of the dialectic of authoritarian submission, to the ‘market’ status quo, and authoritarian aggression, against those who cannot or do not want to keep pace in the market and are denounced as ‘unproductive’). Although this lack of solidarity can also be focused towards ‘parasitic’ e´lites (financial speculators or politicians who support them), their anger is often – indeed, mostly – directed against groups at the social bottom. The form that this takes varies, but it is typically reflected in ‘tax revolts’. Although the underlying sentiment is that those who are not as ‘honest’ and ‘hard-working’ should take the brunt of paying for the crisis (through higher taxation or lower social benefits or a combination of both), the targeting normally involves some form of ideological disenfranchisement. The unemployed working classes are targeted as ‘lazy bums’. Also common are forms of racism, targeting minorities, asylum seekers, etc. As Chip Berlet and Matthew Lyons (2000) have argued in their classic text on US right-wing populism, such populism uses the ‘ideology of the producer’, which juxtaposes the ‘hard-working’, middle (or ‘real’) America and the objects of authoritarian aggression, whatever they may be. In short, if right wing populism can be defined as the radicalization of economic liberalism propelled by (middle-class) authoritarianism mobilized during times of crisis, with its corresponding distributional struggles, the radicalized middle classes, in their fear of social decline, will turn the ideology of the producer against those groups that, according to them, should bear the costs of crisis, particularly those who have gained some social and economic protection from the state. Therefore, the aggression of the middle classes’ core, such as the smallscale entrepreneurs, is usually directed against the bottom third or half of society, which is portrayed as ‘parasitic’ and used as a scapegoat. Moreover, it would be wrong to assume that the right-wing populist ideology could not become generalized across many other social strata, including the (unorganized) working class as well: economic position and (objective) class interest are important, but not determining, factors of political behaviour. Therefore, right-wing populism could hold hegemonic sway across some elements of the working class, especially in situations in which no alternative left forces exist or emerge, as a result of the shift towards neoliberalism on the part of traditional social democratic parties and the more or less thorough demise of communist parties throughout Europe since the late 1980s. It should be noted, therefore, that the struggles to decide post-neoliberal pathways will be characterized by the struggle between two principles: the right-wing populist achiever ideology, with its middle-class social base, versus the (mostly working-class and public-sector-based) social democratic/socialist ideology, focused on the solidarity principle. The openness of the historic process is underlined by the fact that multiple constellations and social coalitions become thinkable – given that the divide between authoritarianism and cultural libertarianism runs vertical to the divide between horizontal collectivism and individualism, which is characteristic of the relationship of social forces vis-a`-vis the economic sphere. Put another way, although the dominance of issues capable of mobilizing authoritarian sentiments among the precarious middle class and the class-unconscious working class – such as foreign threats, high crime rates or racial targets – can lead to the ascent of political right turns and more or less top–middle coalitions, the opposite is also possible if coalitions can be built between the culturally more left-/libertarian-minded middle classes and the collective-solidarityoriented, but also more authoritarian, lower classes. This is particularly the case if the blocked wage-dependent middle classes, instead of turning against the bottom, form ‘counter-e´lites’ (Walter 2006) within ‘middle–bottom coalitions’ (Brie, Hildebrandt and Meuche-Ma¨ker 2008) as a result of successful left hegemonic politics.

#### The affirmative causes Euro-mimesis – turns the advantage

David Theo Goldberg, 2-18-2009, Professor, Comparative Literature School of Humanities Director, UC Humanities Research Institute Ph.D., City University of New York Graduate School, 1985, Philosophy, “Revealing Alchemies (On Racial Latinamericanization),” <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9781444304695.ch6/summary>

Neo-Americanism, by contrast – this production of the new Americas, of Europe’s alter, as Darcy Ribeiro nominates it – is at the same time the ﬁrst neo-racism. Latin American neo-racism makes explicit at the opening of the nine- teenth century what Europe was simply beginning to gesture towards. Up to the end of the eighteenth century, thinking about race was driven formatively by the restriction of cultural traits racially deﬁned to a sup-posedly unalterable biology. With the new century European intellectuals ﬁrst and social policy considerably later began to shift from this hegemonic racial naturalism to a culturally inscribed historicism, ascribing race to potentially alterable and educable cultural traits and habits. The relative but constrained openness of the “new” world – “open” land for the taking, open horizons for self-making, open possibilities for cultural experimen- tation and invention – meant cultural malleability could be mobilized for purposes of ongoing social control and especially maintenance of racial elevation and existing relations of power. Cultural elevation through euro-mimesis, educability into civilizing mores of European design and deﬁnition, if with local accent, promoted the supposed ascent from indigeneity into whiteness. But this euro-mimesis also meant, even as it cemented into place, that both what could be imagined as the national community and the interests the state could represent were conﬁgured in terms of and around the structures of whiteness. Homi Bhabha has made clear that imitation is never complete, failing always to be fully satisfactory. It lurches, Bhabha says, between resemblance and menace, identiﬁcation and distantiation. It prompts an abiding sense of failure and lack, of limitation and shortfall, of attendant loss but also of displacement, experimentation, possibility, often at the expense of the already racially marginalized. A sense also of anguish, as Freud emphasizes, without being able to grasp what exactly is beyond reach, what precisely not yours or what ought to be. Those registered as racially different, as bruised, are lured into Euro-likeness while warned that its inner treasures are almost always beyond their reach. White-likeness is a liking of what’s white, socially induced, a drive to be white-like, but also a grasping in the dark about its idealized experience, for its treasury. That “playing in the dark,” to twist Toni Morrison’s title, and the more or less extreme ambi- valence both about what one thus is missing and what it is about one that inevitably makes one miss, if only one could put one’s ﬁnger on it, is the sinking sand, the depressing frustrations, of ﬁxating on the unreachable. Euro-mimesis characterizes as much a national commitment as a personal choice or striving. Imitation necessarily judges the qualities of the imitated superior to those of the imitating. It accordingly denies or fails to recognize the virtues and values, contributions and characteristics in and on their own terms of those at hand, of fellow citizens and civic contributors unless socio-cultural clones and drones of the imitated. Frustration follows for the mis- or unrecognized, a swelling fury at the lack of possibilities or cultural closures, a sense of unfulﬁllment of national possibility, an emerging national malaise at the swelling discontent, whether voiced politically or via criminality and social violence. Threat to wellbeing, if not to being itself, becomes threaded with a menace to society as such. And those experiences of malcontent and melancholy at inevitable failure of mimetic fulﬁllment seek compensation in other forms of gratiﬁcation that both engage and exploit, often brutally, those considered non-European. Euro-mimesis, then, is related to – may overlap with – the standard sense of Eurocentrism, though it is not reducible to it. Eurocentrism makes what is recognized as prevailing European values, norms, and cultural expression, historically understood, not just the point and frame of reference but also, as Quijano notes, the telos, if not endpoint, of world historical progress. It is thought to provide the dominant (and dominating) language and style of expression, elbowing to the margins other ways of knowing and being, con- ception and expression, where they might be recognized fuzzily if at all. In a sense, Eurocentrism covers its tracks by refusing any other point of refer- ence as viable, as bearer of (universal) truth. It acknowledges no gap between center and provinces other than in the dismissal of practice at a distance. Euro-mimesis, by contrast, has an inkling of – if it doesn’t fully com- prehend – the inevitable slippages, the replicative failures of and between European inﬂuence, its models, and its copies. It is the source, on one hand, of the doleful sense of loss that affectively follows. And, on the other, it is the prompt of a motivation to do better at it, to improve the blueprint by adaptation to new environments, eventually to undo itself in reaching beyond for something new. This reaching for the horizon of a modernity not yet present, the symbol of a national techno-modernity yet to be real- ized, conjures the unstinting and later self-ironizing sense, for example, of Brazil as the “country of the future” (Brazil, nais do futuro), initially articulated in the 1940s. While the demographic proﬁles differ, Venezuela represents another, complementary feature of a more generalized Latin American mode, namely, the troubled institutionalization of a policy of whitening. In the 1950s, a little later than Brazil and Argentina, for instance, Venezuelan dictator Marcos Perez Jimenez introduced the prevailing national ideal of whitening, both demographically and culturally, importing signiﬁcant numbers of Western European immigrants. The accompanying europeanizing of local culture as the national imperative underpinned the subsequent erasure of race from explicit national reference and policy with the end of the dictatorship in 1958. This simultaneously silenced any attempt to penalize racial discri-mination.

#### This euro-mimesis makes racialized violence and war inevitable – neocolonialism provides the foundations for genocide.

Natalie Billick, 12-04-2004, writer, Nations and Nationalities, “Genocide,” filebox.vt.edu/n/natalieb/teachered/portfolio%20html/Genocide.doc

Genocide is the annihilation of a people based on nationality, ethnicity, race, or religion. For developed countries in the West to understand what ultimately lead to genocides in Nazi Germany and Rwanda during the last century, they must first look toward colonization. Modern genocide was nurtured in the colonies and can be accredited to European expansion and modernization. The illegitimacy of indirect rule through colonization sparked the genocide in Rwanda and the misapplication of industrialism and the extremism caused by modernism played a pivotal role in the Holocaust. Both genocides can be attributed to the political phenomenon known as the weak state. Colonialism provided the foundation for genocide because it resulted in a problem of legitimacy, resulting in weak states. Germany and Rwanda could be considered weak states because of governmental corruption, economic disparity, inequality, and the placement of ethnicity over citizenship. As weak states, Germany and Rwanda were unable to provide a sense of national security. This created an anxiety and fear that culminated with genocide. Slavery, “the first modern collective crime against humanity”, initiated the transition from colonialism to modernism (Weisband). Europeans began occupying other countries during the 1500’s in an attempt to exploit those countries’ natural resources. In the case of Africa, these resources included humans, who were commodified as slave labor. Slavery prompted an increase in cultures oriented around commodification and a transformation of kinship groups to groups organized around ethnicity. As humans became commodified, they were dehumanized by the destruction of their history, belonging, freedom, and future. Slavery exemplified the first step in a transition from colonialism to modernism because slaves and free men represented the beginning of modern divisions of labor. Slavery produced political, cultural, social, and economic results, including failed states, weak nations, minority groups, and racial inequalities. Slavery provides the linkage from colonialism to modernism, but it is colonialism that universalizes it. Colonialism is the creation of non-historical nations and artificial states to benefit the colonizers. European colonizers divide and combine territories with no regard for the political and cultural traditions already in place. In addition, colonizers magnify minute differences in appearance in order to categorize and separate people into ethnicities. It was through colonization that the idea of race developed. “Race was an attempt to biologize and naturalize class difference” (Mamdani 388). The ‘racialization’ of race that began in the colonies provided justification for the extermination of entire groups of people. Kinship groups are changed to ethnic groups through reification, causing anxiety and provoking hatred. This hatred is furthered by neo-colonialism; the exportation and integration of Western values into the colonies. Neo-colonialism causes cultural mimesis, or the replacement of kinship with Western values. It leads to mimetic dysfunctionalism when the colonized are forced to give up part of themselves or their values in order to adopt those of the colonizers. Although there is a desire to be a part of the imposed culture, a feeling of inferiority arises from the devalorization of their native culture. The result is a sense of self-rejection and guilt which ultimately leads to hate. Problems arise when colonizers are only partially effective in creating replicas of modern nation-states. One reaction to colonialism and neo-colonialism is nativism; a rejection of modernity and an attempt to reassert kinship identities. Nativism occurs in weak states because central authority lacks legitimacy, allowing for the continued support of kinship ideals and the opposition of national homogenization.
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#### Here’s proof – they allow tons of random unilateral measures

CSG 13 [Cuba Study Group, a non-profit, non-partisan organization, comprised of business and community leaders of Cuban descent who share a common interest and vision of a free and democratic Cuba, “Restoring Executive Authority Over U.S. Policy Toward Cuba,” Feb 2013, <http://www.cubastudygroup.org/index.cfm/files/serve?File_id=45d8f827-174c-4d43-aa2f-ef7794831032>]

4. Additional Steps the U.S. President Can Take to Promote Change in Cuba¶ While we wait for Congress to act, the Executive Branch should exercise its licensing authority to further safeguard the flow of contacts and resources into the Island, encourage independent economic and political activity, and further empower the Cuban people. To that end, the Cuba Study Group proposes that the President pursue the following measures:¶ i) Modify Remittance and Export Limitations: Increase the $3,000 limit on remittances that can be carried to Cuba by authorized travelers and expand the types of goods that travelers may legally take to Cuba to support micro entrepreneurs. Fewer limitations in these areas will make it easier for U.S. travelers to provide seed capital and in-kind contributions for start-ups.¶ ii) Authorize Travel by General License for NGOs and Allow Them to Open Cuban Bank Accounts: Regulations enacted on January 28, 2011 allow U.S. full- and part-time university staff to travel to Cuba by general license. These regulations also allow U.S.-based academic institutions to open accounts in Cuban banks with funds to support their educational programs in Cuba. A similar license for foundations and NGOs whose mission involves support for micro and small businesses would also help support this growing segment of civil society.¶ iii) Establish New Licenses for the Provision of Services to Cuban Private Entrepreneurs: The President could build on existing authorizations that allow U.S. persons and institutions to pay individual Cuban scholars musicians and artists for their work. New licenses could extend to additional groups, such as artisans or farmers, and authorize a greater scope of activities such as recording, publication, distribution, etc.¶ iv) Authorize Imports of Certain Goods and Services to Businesses and Individuals Engaged in Certifiably Independent Economic Activity in Cuba: The President could authorize the importation of limited types of Cuban-origin goods and services under general or specific licenses, particularly when such authorizations could be justified as providing support for the Cuban people or democratic change in Cuba. For example, the President could authorize imports from private producers or allow U.S. persons to directly engage and hire Cuban professionals.¶ v) Authorize Export and Sale of Goods and Services to Businesses and Individuals Engaged in Certifiably Independent Economic Activity in Cuba: Amend existing licensing policy to establish a presumption of approval for specific items deemed to support the U.S.-stated policy goal of promoting independent economic activity on the Island. Since 2000, legislation has allowed the export of a broad range of agricultural products and a limited range of medicines and medical devices. This should be expanded to include other inputs in demand by indepen - dent businesses, including—but not limited to—good such as art supplies, food preparation equipment, bookkeeping materials, and basic electronic equipment and software required for retail sales and business administration.¶ vi) Authorize the Sale of Telecommunications Hardware in Cuba : Current U.S. regulations, as amended by the Obama administration in 2009, allow for donations of some telecommunications equipment, thereby recognizing that these goods by themselves do not violate the embargo. The next step should be to allow for the sales of those same goods inside the Island. Along with those provisions, changes should also allow for the provision of general travel licenses for research, marketing and sale of those goods.¶ vii) Authorize the Reestablishment of Ferry Services to Cuba : Current U.S. regulations allow both “aircraft and vessels” to serve Cuba as an exception to the U.S. embargo against the Island. The use of chartered aircrafts to transport Cuban-Americans and other licensed U.S. travelers to and from Cuba has long been authorized by the U.S. Department of Treasury. The next step should be to reestablish safe and secure chartered ferry services to transport the same categories of passengers to and from Cuba. Ferry service offers an affordable alternative to airline travel to Cuba and would allow an increase in the amount of goods that Cuban-Americans and other licensed travelers may legally take to Cuba to support their families and micro entrepreneurs.¶ viii) Simplify the Provision of Controlled Commodities, such as Computers and Laptops Direct the Department of Commerce to provide more detailed guidance for individuals to determine whether or not controlled commodities, such as laptops and printers, qualify under the general export waiver.¶ ix) Allow Licensed U.S. Travelers Access to U.S.-Issued Debit, Credit, and Pre-Paid Cards and Other Financial Services While on Authorized Travel in Cuba: Currently, U.S. travelers to Cuba have no access to U.S. bank accounts, credit cards, debit cards or other basic financial services. With few exceptions, U.S. travelers are forced to carry cash with them to Cuba. Allowing U.S. travelers access to electronic payment systems would help ensure their safety and security while being on the Island. Moreover, authorizing new electronic payment systems would facilitate the Administration’s goal of promoting people-to-people contacts and facilitating private economic activity by safeguarding the transfer of money from U.S. residents to relatives and independent entrepreneurs on the island.¶ x) Review Cuba’s Designation as a State Sponsor of Terrorism: Cuba’s status on the State Department’s list of state sponsors of terrorism has been subject to debate for more than a decade. The President should order a comprehensive, apolitical review to determine whether this designation reflects the reality of Cuba today.¶ xi) Develop an expanded bilateral agenda with a range of specific topics of mutual interest : Agenda should include topics such as the resolution of property claims to help foster an environment of dialogue, problem- solving and trust building— thereby helping to set the stage for an eventual normalization of relations.

## Kritik

### 2NC – Alternative

#### We must define Latin America without Eurocentric context.

Eugenia Demuro, Nov 2012 (Visiting Fellow, School of Language Studies, College of Arts and Social Sciences, Australian National University, “Examining ‘Latinidad’ in Latin America: Race, ‘Latinidad’ and the Decolonial Option”, http://www.acrawsa.org.au/files/ejournalfiles/187Demurofinalversion.pdf :)

The invention of Latin America as an outcome of European expansion constitutes the problem of defining Latin America. As has been the case in discussions from and about Latin America (whether in pursuit of an elusive progress, development or civilisation—concepts defined in European terms— or in discussions against these models—in search of an ‘authentic’ Latin American subject set against universal Western forms) it would seem inevitable to project European models onto Latin America. However, the flaw with existing accounts is that they perpetually reinvent the unequal distribution of power between Europe and Latin America without resolving it, being unable to imagine Latin America without conjuring Europe – a problem that is not true in the reverse order. In other words, they reify the power relations of coloniality. It is clear that Latin America’s post-colonial condition cannot be resolved while the solutions emanate from the perspective of coloniality, wherein the world is understood from a particular geo-political knowledge which has consolidated European and Western supremacy against all other cultures. In this respect, the attempt to define Latin America with reference to Europe marks the continuing success of the colonial project. To overcome this, new ways of understanding Latin America that do not rely on Europe and Western epistemology for legitimacy, are required. As Linda Martín Alcoff explains: […] we need a more extensive period of epistemological reflection. We need to develop a decolonial critical theory that will be more thoroughly delinked from the contemporary variants of the modern imperial designs of the recent past. The fact that language, space, time, and history have all been colonized through the colonization of knowledge must give us pause before we borrow the founding concepts of Eurocentric thought, such as centre/periphery, tradition/modernity, and primitive/civilized, or the very evaluative binary structure that grounds these (2007: 86 my emphasis). The task at hand is thus to step outside the hegemonic normative ways of thinking and of being, which give validity and support the idea of Western universality and its epistemology. Instead we need to re-think a world where identities, knowledge/s, cultures and ways of being are not positioned within hierarchical dualisms but where pluriversality is a reality.

# 1NR

## Case

### Euromimesis – 1

#### Here’s contextual evidence

**Reich ‘7**

(Robert Reich, Professor of Public Policy, UC Berkeley; fmr US Secretary of Labor, “How Capitalism is Killing Democracy,” http://www.robertreich.org/reich/20070901.asp accessed 7/9/09)

But citizens living in democratic nations aren’t similarly constrained. They have the ability to alter the rules of the game so that the cost to society need not be so great. And yet, we’ve increasingly left those responsibilities to the private sector—to the companies themselves and their squadrons of lobbyists and public-relations experts—pretending as if some inherent morality or corporate good citizenship will compel them to look out for the greater good. But they have no responsibility to address inequality or protect the environment on their own. We forget that **they are simply duty bound to protect the bottom line**. Why has capitalism succeeded while democracy has steadily weakened? Democracy has become enfeebled largely because companies, in intensifying competition for global consumers and investors, have invested ever greater sums in lobbying, public relations, and even bribes and kickbacks, seeking laws that give them a competitive advantage over their rivals. **The result is an arms race for political influence that is drowning out the voices of average citizens**. In the United States, for example, the fights that preoccupy Congress, those that consume weeks or months of congressional staff time, are typically contests between competing companies or industries.

#### It also is an epistemology disad to them – reject their authors

**Schiwy and Ennis ‘2**

(Freya Schiwy, Ph.D. Candidate, Romance Studies, Duke University, and Michael Ennis, Ph.D. Candidate, Literature, Duke University, 2002, Nepantla: Views From the South, Volume 3 // Issue 1, Muse)

The essays gathered in this dossier respond to issues raised during the workshop “Knowledges and the Known: Capitalism and the Geopolitics of Knowledge,” held at Duke University in November 2000. They address concerns about the possibilities for critical knowledge production at a moment when national state structures are reconfiguring into global institutions and when technologies (like gene prospecting) and epistemic regimes (like property rights and human rights) are installing the particular as a new universal, following the legacy of Enlightenment philosophy and Western political theory. They ask how knowledge production is linked to location and subjectivity and what the importance of these critical perspectives can be when neoliberal capitalism increasingly **instrumentalizes and commodifies knowledge**, **reinforcing the growing dependence of universities around the world on corporate money.** It is precisely within this context that Oscar Guardiola-Rivera engages current critical theory from the perspective of coloniality. Although the essays by Catherine Walsh and Javier Sanjinés address contemporary indigenous uprisings in the Andes, these movements are not their object of study. Instead of being about knowledge production in the Andes, all three of these articles are efforts to think about epistemology from the Andes.1

### Euromimesis – Cuba

#### U.S. treatment of Cuba is rooted in the National Security State.

Jacob Hornberger, July 17, 2013 (Jacob G. Hornberger is founder and president of The Future of Freedom Foundation., “THE PARANOID OBSESSION OVER CUBA”, http://fff.org/2013/07/17/the-paranoid-obsession-over-cuba/ :)

The U.S. government’s belligerence toward Venezuela, Nicaragua, Bolivia, and Ecuador for sympathizing with Edward Snowden’s request for asylum brings to mind the U.S. national-security state’s Cold War mindset toward communism, a mindset characterized by deception, delusion, and paranoia, a mindset that did immeasurable harm to the American people as well as people in Latin America and that continues to do so to the present date. Let’s go back to April 1962 — after the CIA’s and Pentagon’s botched invasion of Cuba by Cuban exiles at the Bay of Pigs and before the Cuban Missile Crisis that brought the United States and the Soviet Union to the brink of nuclear war. Having met with President Kennedy’s rejection of Operation Northwoods, a plan by the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) to initiate fake terrorist attacks and fake hijackings in order to provide a pretext for a full-scale U.S. invasion of Cuba, the chairman of the JCS, Lyman Lemnitzer, submitted a memorandum to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara that stated in part: 1. The Joint Chiefs of Staff believe that the Cuban problem must be solved in the near future. Further, they see no prospect of early success in overthrowing the present Communist regime either as a result of internal uprisings or external political, economic, or psychological pressures. Accordingly, they believe that military intervention by the United States will be required to overthrow the present Communist regime. 2. The United States cannot tolerate permanent existence of a Communist government in the Western Hemisphere. The present regime in Cuba provides Communism with a base of operations for espionage, sabotage, and subversion against Latin America…. Really? Well, now let’s see: Communist Cuba has now been in existence for more than 50 years. As far as I can see, the United States is still standing. Neither the East Coast nor the West Coast has fallen into the ocean. The public (i.e., government) schools are still run by American citizens. The IRS is still manned by American bureaucrats. In fact, it would seem that the U.S. government is far fatter and more bloated than it ever was in 1962. So, where is the big threat to “national security” that Cuba was supposed to pose to the United States by virtue of it having a communist regime? Was the threat to “national security” supposed to be that the Cuban army would invade Florida and make its way up the Eastern Seaboard and march triumphantly into Washington, D.C.? Was it that Fidel Castro would initiate a series of assassinations against U.S. officials? Or was it that Castro would sneak books on communism into America’s public schools? Well, none of that ever happened! Oh wait! Apparently the threat to “national security” was that Cuba would cause other nations to go communist. You know, like Venezuela, Ecuador, Bolivia, or Nicaragua! To which one might respond: And so what? Why should that have caused Americans to lose any sleep? After all, for all practical purposes all those countries have gone communist. All four of them have adopted extreme socialist programs and, in fact, two of them—Venezuela and Nicaragua—have openly aligned themselves with Cuba and Castro. Who cares? Well, except for the Pentagon and the CIA and those Americans who are still convinced that that Americans are in danger of falling to communism and who are still looking for communists (and terrorists, Muslims, drug dealers, and illegal aliens) under their beds. In fact, consider Nicaragua’s president, Daniel Ortega. Remember him? He was the president of Nicaragua when the Reagan administration initiated its illegal Contra war within Nicaragua, an unnecessary war that took the lives of countless Nicaraguans. Americans were told that such a war was absolutely necessary because the Ortega regime was a communist one and, therefore, threatened the “national security” of the United States. What a crock. Today, guess who the president of Nicaragua is. You guessed it—Daniel Ortega. And he hasn’t changed a bit. He’s still as communist and socialist as he always has been. So what? How many Americans lose sleep over the possibility that Nicaragua is going to send troops to invade and occupy the United States and run the public schools, the IRS, and the Interstate Highway System? The fact is that it never mattered one iota whether every single country in Latin America went communist or socialist. In fact, in terms of economic principles, they all have. Just look at their programs. All of them embrace such socialistic programs as old-age assistance, government-provided healthcare, public schooling, and income taxation. And not one of them has ever indicated a desire or ability to invade and occupy the United States, assuming that that’s what a threat to “national security” means. National-security statists say that there was danger that the Soviet Union would establish military bases in Latin America, to which one might respond: “You mean, like the U.S. bases surrounding the Soviet Union?” In fact, in that memo cited above, the JCS also pointed out: “While considered unlikely, it is possible for the Sino-Soviet Bloc to establish military bases in Cuba similar to U.S. installations around the Bloc periphery.” But again, the other obvious question is: So what? Foreign military bases are nothing but a huge cancerous drain on the resources of a nation. They are a burden on a citizenry, not an asset. Soviet military bases in the Western hemisphere would have accelerated the bankruptcy of the Soviet Union, just as America’s overseas military bases are doing to our country. Moreover, despite all the fear-mongering from the Pentagon and the CIA during the Cold War, the fact is that the Soviets wanted to avoid nuclear war even more than Americans did. Despite the lies put out by the Pentagon and the CIA regarding the so-called missile gap, the Soviets always knew that they were far outgunned by the United States and that they could never win a nuclear war, not even if they struck first. In fact, that was confirmed when the Soviets took their nuclear missiles out of Cuba in return for Kennedy’s promise to remove U.S. nuclear missiles in Turkey aimed at the Soviet Union and his promise not invade Cuba, a promise that the Pentagon and the CIA considered was a grave and humiliating defeat for the United States. If the Soviets had wanted a nuclear war, that was the time to initiate it — when they had operational nuclear missiles 90 miles away from American shores. Moreover, if concern over a Soviet conquest of the United States was the real reason for the Pentagon’s and CIA’s long-term paranoid obsession over Cuba, what’s their excuse for their paranoid obsession with Cuba today? The Cold War ended more than ten years ago. The Soviet Union is dismantled. East and West Germany are one. Soviet troops are out of Eastern Europe. Vietnam is united. China and Russia are friends of the United States So, why the continuation of their cruel and inhumane embargo against Cuba? Why continue to prevent the Cuban people from improving their economic well-being through trade and interactions with the American people? Why continue jailing and fining Americans who travel to Cuba and spend money there? Why punish foreign businesses that do business with Cuba?

### Euromimesis – Racism

#### Racism must be rejected – it’s a precondition for moral precoherence.

Albert **Memmi, 2k**, Racism, p. 159-161

Evidently, I am a moderate optimist. The struggle against racism will be long and probably never totally successful. Humans [Vhomme] being what they are, one cannot for the moment hope for a total end to racist behavior. Even mixed marriage is not a remedy; the example of Brazil is hardly encouraging. There, rather than disappear, racism has created a more complex color hierarchy. In the Caribbean, social classes correspond to a scale of colors. It is as if racism can always find, in each case, the tactic or machination that will work.21 / But yet, humans being what they are, the job can and should be undertaken. People are both angels and beasts; the angel must be assisted in prevailing over the beast. Or, more prosaically, reciprocal dependence must be strengthened as the foundation of the social bond. Whatever the importance of a conflict between individuals or groups, the relative stability of social structures confirms a reciprocal need to engender an inclusive common law of life. Racism represents precisely the inverse process, since it is a temptation to exclude and the legitimation of exclusion. / The pessimist will object that this is pure rhetoric designed to repackage the same old conduct. But even rhetorical effort is not wasted. Beyond its perversity, the racist discourse is a defense mechanism [plaidoyer] and an alibi. But every search for an alibi also contains within it an implicit recognition of the law. Racism is a structure of aggression that claims, and is given, a presupposed rationality. This pretense is the sign of its cunning and its false assertion of its own humanity. That is why no one wishes to own up to being racist; no one wishes to consent, in their heart, to renounce all humanity. The most hardened racists at least have one ear that hears, a port directly connected to that part of themselves that does not totally approve of iniquity and oppression. The mania and the horror of Nazism comes from what it had renounced of all legitimization, that it had made racism a philosophy if not a total conception of humanity. / Is that all there is? The infinite task before us can be discouraging in that it must always be begun again. Up to now, all peace has only been a truce between two wars, yet still we hope and long for peace. Health is fragile, and death is always in the offing, yet still we struggle to keep ourselves in good health. The struggle against racism is the condition of our collective social health. It encompasses the fundamental moral discussions of love or hate of the other, of justice or injustice, equality or oppression, or, in a word, one's very humanity. The essence of morality is respect for the other. Our honor as humans will be to construct a more human world. In the meanwhile, so that even animals may some day find a world of peace and security, let us act so that no one is any longer treated like a beast.