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**Fetishizing black subjectivity makes class invisible—failing to take into account these racist relations in the name of economic progress**

**Young,** Asst Prof of English at Univ of Alabama, Winter 20**06**

[Robert, *Putting Materialism Back into Race Theory*, <http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2006/puttingmaterialismbackintoracetheory.htm>]

Indeed, the discourse of the subject operates as an ideological strategy for fetishizing the black experience and, consequently, it positions black subjectivity beyond the reach of Marxism. For example, in the *Afrocentric Idea*, Asante dismisses Marxism because it is Eurocentric (8), but are the core concepts of Marxism, such as class and mode of production, only relevant for European social formations? Are African and African-American social histories/relations unshaped by class structures? Asante assumes that class hierarchies do not structure African or the African-American social experiences, and this reveals the class politics of Afrocentricity: it makes class invisible. Asante's assumption, which erases materialism, enables him to offer the idealist formulation that the "word creates reality" (70). The political translation of such idealism is not surprisingly very conservative. Asante directs us away from critiquing capitalist institutions, in a manner similar to the ideological protocol of the Million Man March, and calls for vigilance against symbolic oppression. As Asante tellingly puts it, "symbol imperialism, rather than institutional racism, is the major social problem facing multicultural societies" (56). In the realm of African-American philosophy, Howard McGary Jr. also deploys the discourse of the (black) subject to mark the limits of Marxism. For instance, in a recent interview, McGary offers this humanist rejection of Marxism: "I don't think that the levels of alienation experienced by Black people are rooted primarily in economic relations" (Interview 90). For McGary, black alienation exceeds the logic of Marxist theory and thus McGary's idealist assertion that "the sense of alienation experienced by Black people in the US is also rooted in the whole idea of what it means to be a human being and how that has been understood" (Interview 90). McGary confuses causes and effects and then misreads Marxism as a descriptive modality. Marxism is not concerned as much with descriptive accounts, the effects, as much as it is with explanatory accounts. That is, it is concerned with the cause of social alienation because such an explanatory account acts as a guide for praxis. Social alienation is an historical effect and its explanation does not reside in the experience itself; therefore, it needs explanation and such an explanation emerges from the transpersonal space of concepts. In theorizing the specificity of black alienation, McGary reveals his contradictory ideological coordinates. First, he argues that black alienation results from cultural "beliefs". Then, he suggests that these cultural "norms" and "practices" develop from slavery and Jim Crow, which are fundamentally economic relations for the historically specific exploitation of black people. If these cultural norms endogenously emerge from the economic systems of slavery and Jim Crow, as McGary correctly suggests, then and contrary to McGary's expressed position, black alienation is very much rooted in economic relations. McGary's desire to place black subjectivity beyond Marxism creates contradictions in his text. McGary asserts that the economic structures of slavery and Jim Crow shape cultural norms. Thus in a post-slavery, post-Jim Crow era, there would still be an economic structure maintaining contemporary oppressive norms—from McGary's logic this must be the case. However, McGary remains silent on the contemporary economic system structuring black alienation: capitalism. Apparently, it is legitimate to foreground and critique the historical connection between economics and alienation but any inquiry into the present day connection between economics and alienation is off limits. This other economic structure—capitalism—remains the unsaid in McGary's discourse, and consequently he provides ideological support for capitalism—the exploitative infrastructure which produces and maintains alienation for blacks as well as for all working people. In a very revealing moment, a moment that confirms my reading of McGary's pro-capitalist position, he asserts that "it is possible for African-Americans to combat or overcome this form of alienation described by recent writers without overthrowing capitalism" (20). Here, in a most lucid way, we see the ideological connection between the superstructure (philosophy) and the base (capitalism). Philosophy provides ideological support for capitalism, and, in this instance, we can also see how philosophy carries out class politics at the level of theory (Althusser *Lenin* 18). McGary points out "that Black people have been used in ways that white people have not" (91). His observation may be true, but it does not mean that whites have not also been "used"; yes, whites may be "used" differently, but they are still "used" because that is the logic of exploitative regimes—people are "used", that is to say, their labor is commodified and exchanged for profit. McGary's interview signals what I call an "isolationist" view. This view disconnects black alienation from other social relations; hence, it ultimately reifies race, and, in doing so, suppresses materialist inquiries into the class logic of race. That is to say, the meaning of race is not to be found within its own internal dynamics but rather in dialectical relation to and as an ideological justification of the exploitative wage-labor economy. This isolationist position finds a fuller and, no less problematic, articulation in Charles W. Mills' *The Racial Contract*, a text which undermines the possibility for a transracial transformative political project. Mills evinces the ideological assumptions and consequent politics of the isolationist view in a long endnote to chapter 1. Mills privileges race oppression, but, in doing so, he must suppress other forms of oppression, such as gender and class. Mills acknowledges that there are gender and class relations within the white population, but he still privileges race, as if the black community is not similarly divided along gender and class lines. Hence, the ideological necessity for Mills to execute a double move: he must marginalize class difference within the white community and suppress it within the black community. Consequently, Mills removes the possibility of connecting white supremacy, a political-cultural structure, to its underlying economic base. Mills empiricist framework mystifies our understanding of race. If "white racial solidarity has overridden class and gender solidarity" (138), as he proposes, then what is needed is an explanation of this racial formation. If race is the "identity around which whites have usually closed ranks" (138), then why is the case? Without an explanation, it seems as if white solidarity reflects some kind of metaphysical alliance. White racial solidarity is an historical articulation that operates to defuse class antagonism within white society, and it is maintained and reproduced through discourses of ideology. The race contract provides whites with an imaginary resolution of actual social contradictions, which are not caused by blacks, but by an exploitative economic structure. The race contract enables whites to scapegoat blacks and such an ideological operation displaces any understanding of the exploitative machinery. Hence, the race contract provides a political cover which ensures the ideological reproduction of the conditions of exploitation, and this reproduction further deepens the social contradictions—the economic position of whites becomes more and more depressed by the very same economic system that they help to ideologically reproduce.

#### Capitalism causes extinction and structural violence

Herod, 07 – Columbia U graduate and political activist (James, , “Getting Free” Pg. 22-23)

We must never forget that we are at war, however, and that we have been for five hundred years. We are involved in class warfare. This defines our situation historically and sets limits to what we can do. It would be nice to think of peace, for example, but this is out of the question. It is excluded as an option by historical conditions. Peace can be achieved only by destroying capitalism. The casualties from this war, on our side, long ago reached astronomical sums. It is estimated that thirty million people perished during the first century of the capitalist invasion of the Americas, including millions of Africans who were worked to death as slaves. Thousands of peasants died in the great revolts in France and Germany in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. During the enclosures movement in England and the first wave of industrialization, hundreds of thousands of people died needlessly. African slaves died by the millions (an estimated fifteen million) during the Atlantic crossing. Hundreds of poor people were hanged in London in the early nineteenth century to enforce the new property laws. During the Paris uprising of 1871, thirty thousand communards were slaughtered. Twenty million were lost in Joseph Stalin’s gulag, and millions more perished during the 1930s when the Soviet state expropriated the land and forced the collectivization of agriculture an event historically comparable to the enclosures in England (and thus the Bolsheviks destroyed one of the greatest peasant revolutions of all time). Thousands of militants were murdered by the German police during the near revolution in Germany and Austria in 1919. Thousands of workers and peasants were killed during the Spanish Civil War. Adolf Hitler killed ten million people in concentration camps (including six million Jews in the gas chambers**).** An estimated two hundred thousand labor leaders, activists, and citizens have been murdered in Guatemala since the coup engineered by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in 1954. Thousands were lost in the Hungarian Revolution of 1956. Half a million communists were massacred in Indonesia in 1975. Millions of Vietnamese were killed by French and U.S. capitalists during decades of colonialism and war. And how many were killed during British capital’s subjugation of India, and during capitalist Europe’s colonization of Asia and Africa? A major weapon of capitalists has always been to simply murder those who are threatening their rule. Thousands were killed by the contras and death squads in Nicaragua and El Salvador. Thousands were murdered in Chile by Augusto Pinochet during his counterrevolution, after the assassination of Salvador Allende. Speaking of assassinations, there is a long list: Patrice Lumumba, Rosa Luxemburg, Antonio Gramsci (died in prison), Ricardo Flores Magon (died in prison), Che Guevara, Gustav Landauer, Malcolm X, Martin Luther King Jr., Fred Hampton, George Jackson, the Haymarket anarchists, Amilcar Cabral, Steve Biko, Karl Liebnicht, Nat Turner, and thousands more. Thousands are being murdered every year now in Colombia. Thousands die every year in the workplace in the United States alone. Eighty thousand die needlessly in hospitals annually in the United States due to malpractice and negligence. Fifty thousand die each year in automobile accidents in the United States, deaths directly due to intentional capitalist decisions to scuttle mass transit in favor of an economy based on oil, roads, and cars (and unsafe cars to boot). Thousands have died in mines since capitalism began. Millions of people are dying right now, every year, from famines directly attributable to capitalists and from diseases easily prevented but for capitalists. Nearly all poverty-related deaths are because of capitalists. We cannot begin to estimate the stunted, wasted, and shortened lives caused by capitalists, not to mention the millions who have died fighting their stupid little world wars and equally stupid colonial wars. (This enumeration is very far from complete.) Capitalists (generically speaking) are not merely thieves; they are murderers. Their theft and murder is on a scale never seen before in history a scale so vast it boggles the mind. Capitalists make Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, Genghis Khan, and Attila the Hun look like boy scouts. This is a terrible enemy we face.

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

Tumino, 01 – teaches at the City University of New York, Spring (Steven, “What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More Than Ever Before”)

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

**Ericson 3** (Jon M., Dean Emeritus of the College of Liberal Arts – California Polytechnic U., et al., The Debater’s Guide, Third Edition, p. 4)

The Proposition of Policy: Urging Future Action In policy propositions, each topic contains certain key elements, although they have slightly different functions from comparable elements of value-oriented propositions. 1. An agent doing the acting ---“The United States” in “The United States should adopt a policy of free trade.” Like the object of evaluation in a proposition of value, the agent is the subject of the sentence. 2. The verb should—the first part of a verb phrase that urges action. 3. An action verb to follow *should* in the *should*-verb combination. For example, should adopt here means to put a program or policy into action though governmental means. 4. A specification of directions or a limitation of the action desired. The phrase *free trade*, for example, gives direction and limits to the topic, which would, for example, eliminate consideration of increasing tariffs, discussing diplomatic recognition, or discussing interstate commerce. Propositions of policy deal with future action. Nothing has yet occurred. The entire debate is about whether something ought to occur. What you agree to do, then, when you accept the *affirmative side* in such a debate is to offer sufficient and compelling reasons for an audience to perform the future action that you propose.

#### The affirmative’s failure to advance a topical defense of federal policy undermines debate’s transformative and intellectual potential.

#### First is limits --- Debate over a controversial point of action creates argumentative stasis --- that’s key to decision-making

Steinberg and Freeley ’13 David Director of Debate at U Miami, Former President of CEDA, officer, American Forensic Association and National Communication Association. Lecturer in Communication studies and rhetoric. Advisor to Miami Urban Debate League, Masters in Communication, and Austin, JD, Suffolk University, attorney who focuses on criminal, personal injury and civil rights law, Argumentation and Debate Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making, Thirteen Edition

Debate is a means of settling differences, so there must be a controversy, a difference of opinion or a conflict of interest before there can be a debate. If everyone is in agreement on a feet or value or policy, there is no need or opportunity for debate; the matter can be settled by unanimous consent. Thus, for example, it would be pointless to attempt to debate "Resolved: That two plus two equals four,” because there is simply no controversy about this state­ment. Controversy is an essential prerequisite of debate. Where there is no clash of ideas, proposals, interests, or expressed positions of issues, there is no debate. Controversy invites decisive choice between competing positions. Debate cannot produce effective decisions without clear identification of a question or questions to be answered. For example, general argument may occur about the broad topic of illegal immigration. How many illegal immigrants live in the United States? What is the impact of illegal immigration and immigrants on our economy? What is their impact on our communities? Do they commit crimes? Do they take jobs from American workers? Do they pay taxes? Do they require social services? Is it a problem that some do not speak English? Is it the responsibility of employers to discourage illegal immigration by not hiring undocumented workers? Should they have the opportunity to gain citizenship? Does illegal immigration pose a security threat to our country? Do illegal immigrants do work that American workers are unwilling to do? Are their rights as workers and as human beings at risk due to their status? Are they abused by employers, law enforcement, housing, and businesses? How are their families impacted by their status? What is the moral and philosophical obligation of a nation state to maintain its borders? Should we build a wall on the Mexican border, establish a national identification card, or enforce existing laws against employers? Should we invite immigrants to become U.S. citizens? Surely you can think of many more concerns to be addressed by a conversation about the topic area of illegal immigration. Participation in this “debate” is likely to be emotional and intense. However, it is not likely to be productive or useful without focus on a particular question and identification of a line demarcating sides in the controversy. To be discussed and resolved effectively, controversies are best understood when seated clearly such that all parties to the debate share an understanding about the objec­tive of the debate. This enables focus on substantive and objectively identifiable issues facilitating comparison of competing argumentation leading to effective decisions. Vague understanding results in unfocused deliberation and poor deci­sions, general feelings of tension without opportunity for resolution, frustration, and emotional distress, as evidenced by the failure of the U.S. Congress to make substantial progress on the immigration debate. Of course, arguments may be presented without disagreement. For exam­ple, claims are presented and supported within speeches, editorials, and advertise­ments even without opposing or refutational response. Argumentation occurs in a range of settings from informal to formal, and may not call upon an audi­ence or judge to make a forced choice among competing claims. Informal dis­course occurs as conversation or panel discussion without demanding a decision about a dichotomous or yes/no question. However, by definition, debate requires "reasoned judgment on a proposition. The proposition is a statement about which competing advocates will offer alternative (pro or con) argumenta­tion calling upon their audience or adjudicator to decide. The proposition pro­vides focus for the discourse and guides the decision process. Even when a decision will be made through a process of compromise, it is important to iden­tify the beginning positions of competing advocates to begin negotiation and movement toward a center, or consensus position. It is frustrating and usually unproductive to attempt to make a decision when deciders are unclear as to what the decision is about. The proposition may be implicit in some applied debates (“Vote for me!”); however, when a vote or consequential decision is called for (as in the courtroom or in applied parliamentary debate) it is essential that the proposition be explicitly expressed (“the defendant is guilty!”). In aca­demic debate, the proposition provides essential guidance for the preparation of the debaters prior to the debate, the case building and discourse presented during the debate, and the decision to be made by the debate judge after the debate. Someone disturbed by the problem of a growing underclass of poorly educated, socially disenfranchised youths might observe, “Public schools are doing a terri­ble job! They' are overcrowded, and many teachers are poorly qualified in their subject areas. Even the best teachers can do little more than struggle to maintain order in their classrooms." That same concerned citizen, facing a complex range of issues, might arrive at an unhelpful decision, such as "We ought to do some­thing about this” or, worse, “It’s too complicated a problem to deal with." Groups of concerned citizens worried about the state of public education could join together to express their frustrations, anger, disillusionment, and emotions regarding the schools, but without a focus for their discussions, they could easily agree about the sorry state of education without finding points of clarity or potential solutions. A gripe session would follow. But if a precise question is posed—such as “What can be done to improve public education?”—then a more profitable area of discussion is opened up simply by placing a focus on the search for a concrete solution step. One or more judgments can be phrased in the form of debate propositions, motions for parliamentary debate, or bills for legislative assemblies, The statements "Resolved: That the federal government should implement a program of charter schools in at-risk communities” and “Resolved; That the state of Florida should adopt a school voucher program" more clearly identify specific ways of dealing with educational problems in a manageable form, suitable for debate. They provide specific policies to be investigated and aid discussants in identifying points of difference. This focus contributes to better and more informed decision making with the potential for better results. In aca­demic debate, it provides better depth of argumentation and enhanced opportu­nity for reaping the educational benefits of participation. In the next section, we will consider the challenge of framing the proposition for debate, and its role in the debate. To have a productive debate, which facilitates effective decision making by directing and placing limits on the decision to be made, the basis for argument should be clearly defined. If we merely talk about a topic, such as ‘"homeless­ness,” or “abortion,” Or “crime,” or “global warming,” we are likely to have an interesting discussion but not to establish a profitable basis for argument. For example, the statement “Resolved: That the pen is mightier than the sword” is debatable, yet by itself fails to provide much basis for dear argumen­tation. If we take this statement to mean *Iliad* the written word is more effec­tive than physical force for some purposes, we can identify a problem area: the comparative effectiveness of writing or physical force for a specific purpose, perhaps promoting positive social change. (Note that “loose” propositions, such as the example above, may be defined by their advocates in such a way as to facilitate a clear contrast of competing sides; through definitions and debate they “become” clearly understood statements even though they may not begin as such. There are formats for debate that often begin with this sort of proposition. However, in any debate, at some point, effective and meaningful discussion relies on identification of a clearly stated or understood proposition.) Back to the example of the written word versus physical force. Although we now have a general subject, we have not yet stated a problem. It is still too broad, too loosely worded to promote weII-organized argument. What sort of writing are we concerned with—poems, novels, government documents, web­site development, advertising, cyber-warfare, disinformation, or what? What does it mean to be “mightier" in this context? What kind of physical force is being compared—fists, dueling swords, bazookas, nuclear weapons, or what? A more specific question might be, “Would a mutual defense treaty or a visit by our fleet be more effective in assuring Laurania of our support in a certain crisis?” The basis for argument could be phrased in a debate proposition such as “Resolved: That the United States should enter into a mutual defense treaty with Laurania.” Negative advocates might oppose this proposition by arguing that fleet maneuvers would be a better solution. This is not to say that debates should completely avoid creative interpretation of the controversy by advo­cates, or that good debates cannot occur over competing interpretations of the controversy; in fact, these sorts of debates may be very engaging. The point is that debate is best facilitated by the guidance provided by focus on a particular point of difference, which will be outlined in the following discussion.

#### Second is fairness --- what the aff said was not fair to the negative --- we have been excluded --- vote against the aff for not caring about capable opponents, key to success of ideas

**Hatab 2**, Prof of Philosophy @ Old Dominion University, (Lawrence J., The Journal of Nietzsche Studies 24 (2002) 132-147)

Moreover, the structure of an agon conceived as a contest can readily underwrite political principles of fairness. Not only do I need an Other to prompt my own achievement, but the significance of any "victory" I might achieve demands an able opponent. As in athletics, defeating an incapable or incapacitated competitor winds up being meaningless. So I should not only will the presence of others in an agon, I should also want that they be able adversaries, that they have opportunities and capacities to succeed in the contest. And I should be able to honor the winner of a fair contest. Such is the logic of competition that contains a host of normative features, which might even include active provisions for helping people in political contests become more able participants**.** [25](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_nietzsche_studies/v024/24.1hatab.html#FOOT25) In addition, agonistic respect need not be associated with something like positive regard or equal worth, a dissociation that can go further in facing up to actual political conditions and problematic connotations that can attach to liberal dispositions. Again allow me to quote my previous work. Democratic respect forbids exclusion, it demands inclusion; but respect for the Other as other can avoid a vapid sense of "tolerance," a sloppy "relativism," or a misplaced spirit of "neutrality." Agonistic respect allows us to simultaneously affirm our beliefs and affirm our opponents as worthy competitors [End Page 142] in public discourse. Here we can speak of respect without ignoring the fact that politics involves perpetual disagreement, and we have an adequate answer to the question "Why should I respect a view that I do not agree with?" In this way beliefs about what is best (aristos) can be coordinated with an openness to other beliefs and a willingness to accept the outcome of an open competition among the full citizenry (demos). Democratic respect, therefore, is a dialogical mixture of affirmation and negation, a political bearing that entails giving all beliefs a hearing, refusing any belief an ultimate warrant, and perceiving one's own viewpoint as agonistically implicated with opposing viewpoints. In sum, we can combine 1) the historical tendency of democratic movements to promote free expression, pluralism, and liberation from traditional constraints, and 2) a Nietzschean perspectivism and agonistic respect, to arrive at a postmodern model of democracy that provides both a nonfoundational openness and an atmosphere of civil political discourse. [26](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_nietzsche_studies/v024/24.1hatab.html#FOOT26) An agonistic politics construed as competitive fairness can sustain a robust conception of political rights**,** not as something "natural" possessed by an original self, but as an epiphenomenal, procedural notion conferred upon citizens in order to sustain viable political practice.

#### Also, Vote for the BEST methodology SANS the permutation.

Permutations are illegitimate in this instance -

1. No predictable stable advocacy – there is no advocacy statement.
2. Reciprocity - No check on aff ground means there should be check on negative ground – the aff traditionally has had to be topical and the neg counterplan or counteradvocacy ground was checked by being competitive. This restores fairness.
3. Method focus makes competition impossible – methods can often be combined for multiple. Make the affirmative stake their ground and test their advocacy my testing with a different method.
4. Err negative on this question – affirmative gets infinite pre-round prep, they have no wiki, and they are not topical, which means that the negative needs some way to test the negative method. Left against left debates are impossible in a world where the aff makes truth statements, leaving the negative to say privilege good or racism good, which is obviously morally reprehensible.

## Case

#### ­­­­­Their sole focus on racial injustice marginalizes bodies affected by other forms of oppression. This leads to violent forms of exclusion and causes further racial oppression-turns the case

**Hutchinson, 99** [Darren Leonard, Assistant Professor, Southern Methodist University School of Law, “Ignoring the Sexualization of Race: Heteonormativity, Critical Race Theory and Anti-Racist Politics,” Buffalo Law Review, Winter, 47 Buffalo L. Rev. 1, pg. lexis, ALB]

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

#### This prevents coalition building, causes alignment with conservative organizations and reinforces oppression across the spectrum

**Hutchinson, 99** [Darren Leonard, Assistant Professor, Southern Methodist University School of Law, “Ignoring the Sexualization of Race: Heteonormativity, Critical Race Theory and Anti-Racist Politics,” Buffalo Law Review, Winter, 47 Buffalo L. Rev. 1, pg. lexis, ALB]

2. Other Problems Caused by Anti-Racist Heteronormativity. In addition to rendering anti-racism internally inconsistent and discriminatory, anti-racist heteronormativity causes a host of other problems and inadequacies. First, the failure of anti-racists to challenge heterosexism conflicts with the inherent purpose of anti-racism - responding to the many, often subtle, ways in which people of color are oppressed in a white supremacist society. By ignoring how the sexualization of race subordinates gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered people of color, anti-racist activists and theorists permit an entire category of racial oppression - homophobic racial subordination - to escape their needed analysis and critique. Thus, contrary to the inherent goals of anti-racism, a species of racial oppression remains unchecked (perhaps endorsed n380) by anti-racist theorists and activists. n381¶ Heteronormativity also harms anti-racist politics and the larger body of progressive political action. On the one hand, anti-racist heteronormativity divides communities of color and hinders the formation of coalitions within communities of color to combat racial oppression. Hetero normativity may also place anti-racist activists in collusion with, and provide legitimacy for, conservative political organizations - organizations that might endorse agendas contrary to the needs of communities of color. In addition, essentialism - in all social movements - prevents collective political action across the terrain of socially oppressed groups. By deploying essentialist politics that deny the importance of combating all forms of inequality, progressive social movements often deteriorate into a futile battle of oppression-ranking, which paralyzes the coalitional potential. ¶ Finally, heteronormativity within anti-racist movements (like forms of hegemony within feminism and gay politics) legitimates the subordination of "other" oppressed people. By questioning the importance of anti-heterosexist politics and legal reform for persons of all races, anti-racists contribute to an oppressive public discourse and ideology that constructs gays, lesbians, bisexuals and the transgendered as deviant and that justifies their oppression. n385 The legitimization of subordination by a progressive movement is (again) patently contradictory.

#### They overprivilege the experience of \_\_\_\_ which fundamentally excludes other bodies affected by the oppression from participating. “Intersecting” forms of privilege and oppression affect everyone --- only our methodology solves the structures they critique

**Hutchinson, 99** [Darren Leonard, Assistant Professor, Southern Methodist University School of Law, “Ignoring the Sexualization of Race: Heteonormativity, Critical Race Theory and Anti-Racist Politics,” Buffalo Law Review, Winter, 47 Buffalo L. Rev. 1, pg. lexis, ALB]¶

I. Multidimensionality: A Challenge to Narrow Conceptions of Oppression and Identity¶ A. Multidimensionality and Intersectionality: Similarities and Differences¶ ¶ In a prior article, I argued that scholars and activists engaged in the development of strategies to combat social inequality must recognize the inherent complexity of systems of oppression (e.g., patriarchy, white supremacy and heterosexism) and the social identity categories around which social power and disempowerment are distributed (e.g., race, gender and sexual orientation). n25 Placing legal theory and politics concerning issues of homosexuality and heterosexism at the focal point of my analysis, I asserted that the various social identity categories and systems of oppression are "inextricably and forever intertwined," that the failure of gay and lesbian legal theorists to interrogate and challenge racial and class subordination produces [\*10] essentialist theories that invariably reflect the experiences of class and race-privileged gays, lesbians and bisexuals, n27 and that gay and lesbian essentialism precludes adequate political, legal and theoretical responses to the contingent and varying effects of heterosexist oppression. n28 Having demonstrated the experiential diversity of gay and lesbian existence, I urged gay and lesbian legal theorists and political activists to employ "multidimensionality" as a theoretical framework for challenging heterosexist subordination. Within the gay and lesbian context, multidimensionality serves as "a methodology by which to analyze the impact of racial and class oppression (or other sources of social inequality) upon sexual subordination and gay and lesbian experience and identity and to cease treating these forces as separable, mutually exclusive, or even conflicting phenomena." n29 By offering multidimensionality to law and sexuality scholars, I hoped to provoke a discourse on the intricacy of sexual subordination and to help reshape legal theory to account for this complexity. More generally, multidimensionality posits that individual acts of discrimination and the various institutions of oppression are complex and multilayered, owing their existence to a host of interlocking sources of advantage and disadvantage.¶ My analysis arose, primarily, out of an impressive body of feminist and critical race literature that has painstakingly countered the notion that sources of oppression operate in isolation from one another. This scholarship has criticized, most extensively, feminist and anti-racist legal theory and politics for failing to examine how the convergence of racial oppression and gender hierarchy often creates unique experiences for women of color - experiences that essentialist theories either submerge or fail to explain accurately. n32 Applying a theoretical approach commonly [\*11] referred to as "intersectionality," these scholars have proposed several public policy and doctrinal reforms that would make civil rights law responsive to the needs and experiences of women of color. ¶ Although I locate my work on the interlocking nature of race, class and sexuality within established scholarship on the synergistic nature of oppression, I also view my writing as both a substantive and conceptual extension and redirection of this literature. While the multidimensionality paradigm differs substantively and conceptually from the intersectionality scholarship, the insightful observations of intersectional scholars created the conditions for the development and evolution of multidimensionality and of other theoretical extensions and rearticulations of intersectionality. ¶ My analysis represents a substantive extension of the prevailing literature on the "intersectionality" of oppression because this latter work has been limited, almost exclusively, to understanding and exploring the operation of just two sources of oppression - patriarchy and racism - in the lives of women of color. My analysis builds upon - yet [\*12] differs from - this work because it explores the social meaning of sexual identity (along with race, gender and class), a topic which, recent scholarship notwithstanding, remains largely unexplored in the intersectionality corpus and in legal theory generally. n¶ Conceptually, my analysis differs from the pre-existing body of intersectional scholarship because it attempts to complicate the implication of this latter work that social identity categories or systems of oppression only "intersect" in the lives of persons burdened by multiple sources of disempowerment, such as women of color. The idea that "intersecting" systems of oppression only affect limited categories of individuals is implied by statements in several writings in the race and gender line of analysis. These statements, together with the almost exclusive focus the literature has given to experiences of women of color - rather than those of white women and men of color - suggest a limited relevance of intersectionality. Neverthe-less, white women and men of color also experience "multi-dimensional" oppression. Men of color and white women, [\*13] however, may not typically conceive of their subordination as a combination of gender and racial hierarchy because "maleness" and "whiteness," privileged and dominant categories in a patriarchal and white supremacist society, are rarely acknowledged to exist but, nevertheless, form the invisible foundation for social policy, civil rights strategies and critical theory. Although some race-gender scholars have acknowledged the multiplicity of white women and men of color experiences, they have not explored significantly the dimensions of these experiences but have limited their analyses primarily to uncovering the multidimensionality of women of color and their historical experiences with subordination.

# 2NC

## Case

#### Our multidimensional approach is the only way to make your advocacy politically viable

**Hutchinson, 99** [Darren Leonard, Assistant Professor, Southern Methodist University School of Law, “Ignoring the Sexualization of Race: Heteonormativity, Critical Race Theory and Anti-Racist Politics,” Buffalo Law Review, Winter, 47 Buffalo L. Rev. 1, pg. lexis, ALB]

This conceptual distinction - that multilayered experiences are "universal" - between the focus of intersectionality and multidimensionality has important implications for future theorizing on the complexity of oppression. First, this distinction problematizes claims such as Mohr's by revealing their discriminatory nature. When skeptics reject the need to embrace multidimensional theories of equality, they falsely imply that their own essentialized theories are "authentic" and "pure." Most likely, however, these theories are in fact multilayered - resting on the transparently multidimensional perspectives of white women and men of color, for example. Mohr's argument itself reflects white gay male positionality because only those persons who do not encounter racial and gender subordination (but who [\*17] enjoy racial and gender privilege) could comfortably describe anti-racist and feminist reforms as "wasteful" and "unnecessary." n50 Thus, Mohr's argument arises out of his own multidimensional positionality as white, gay and male.¶ The universality of multidimensional experience thus presents a difficult question for those who eschew multilayered theories of equality: if everyone has multidimensional experiences and if progressive social theories likely already reflect (though not admittedly) multidimensional perspectives, why should these theories marginalize or exclude particular classes of multidimensional experiences (e.g., those of women of color, gays and lesbians of color, and poor white gay men) from analysis? By conceptualizing multiplicity of experience as a universal concept, multidimensionality compels essentialist theorists to account for the inherently discriminatory nature of their work, which privileges some multilayered experiences over others. Multidimensionality, thus, pushes legal theorists and political activists to recognize the multiple and complex ways in which all individuals experience oppression and construct categories of identity, to acknowledge that equality theory already incorporates transparently multidimensional experiences, and to begin reshaping theory and policy to account for the diversity of harms within oppressed social groups.

#### we are saying that EVERYONE’s experiences of oppression are valuable --- the idea that anti-Blackness is important is not inconsistent with this, but the idea that it is MORE IMPORTANT than the oppression others feel is the link to our argument.

**Perea 97-** prof of law @ UF, visiting prof @ Harvard, leading scholar on race and the law

(Juan, “The Black/White Binary Paradigm of Race,” California Law Review//MGD)

One might object that I am distorting history by suggesting that slavery and the experience of Black Americans has not been of central importance in the formation of American society. I believe this objection misunderstands my arguments. There can be no question, I think, that slavery and the mistreatment of Blacks in the United States were crucial building blocks of American society. The fact that the text of the Constitution protects slavery in so many places demonstrates the importance of slavery in the foundation of the country. The constitutional, statutory and judicial attempts to create more equality for Blacks, imperfect as these all have been, correspond to the history of mistreatment of Blacks. My argument is not that this history should not be an important focus of racial studies. Rather, my argument is that the exclusive focus on the development of equality doctrines based solely on the experience of Blacks, and the exclusive focus of most scholarship on the Black-White relationship, constitutes a paradigm which obscures and prevents the understanding of other forms of inequality, those experienced by non-White, non-Black Americans. The Black/White binary paradigm, by defining only Blacks and Whites as relevant participants in civil rights discourse and struggle, tends to produce and promote the exclusion of other racialized peoples, including Latinos/as, Asian Americans and Native Americans, from this crucial discourse which affects us all. This exclusion is both the power and the stricture of the Black/White binary paradigm. Its power derives from the fact that a limited subject of inquiry makes possible the study of the Black-White relationship in extraordinary detail and with great insight. Its stricture, however, is that it has limited severely our understanding of how White racism operates with particularity against other racialized people. Furthermore, the binary paradigm renders the particular histories of other racialized peoples irrelevant to an understanding of the only racism- White racism against Blacks- that the paradigm defines to be important. This perceived irrelevance is why the history of Latinos/as, Asian Americans, and Native Americans is so frequently missing from the texts that structure our thinking about race.

## Cap K

Class, NOT RACE, is the root cause of whiteness - several reasons:

a) Russia proves

Fields, 90 - professor at Columbia University who specializes in southern history and 19th-century social history (Barbara Jeanne, Slavery, *Race and Ideology in the United States of America*, NLR, I/181, May-June, p. 107, CT)

In explaining why slaveholders in the American South developed a more thorough and elaborate pro-slavery ideology than Russian lords of serfs, Kolchin comes to the brink of this conclusion, only to back away from it into tautology. He argues that the presence of a ‘racial’ distinction between owner and slave that did not exist between lord and serf ‘partly’ accounts for the difference. But, as he quickly concedes, owners of African-descended slaves elsewhere in the Americas did not develop a thorough or consistent pro-slavery argument either. The racial distinction did not ‘exist’ in either the American South or Russia, but was invented in one and not the other. The ‘racial’  distinction between Southern owners and their slaves does not explain anything, but is  itself part of what needs to be explained.

Err with class as root cause, NOT racism - it is critical to prevent further atrocities of military and police presence that threatens humanity and the environment

San Juan Jr., ‘3 - Professor Emeritus of English/Comparative Literature/Ethnic Studies at the University of Conneticut (E., “Marxism and the Race/Class Problematic: A Re-Articulation,” *Cultural Logic*, <http://clogic.eserver.org/2003/sanjuan.html>, CT)

A recent translation of Albert Memmi's magisterial book entitled Racism reminds us that any understanding of the complex network of ideas and practices classified by that term will always lead us to the foundational bedrock of class relations. Memmi defines racism as "the generalized and final assigning of values to real or imaginary differences, to the accuser's benefit and at his victim's expense, in order to justify the former's own privileges or aggression" (2000, 169). The underlying frame of intelligibility for this process of assigning values cannot be anything else but the existence of class-divided societies and nation-states with unequal allocations of power and resources. Both motivation and consequences can be adequately explained by the logic of class oppression and its entailments. In our epoch of globalization, inequality between propertied nation-states (where transnational corporate powers are based) and the rest of the world has become universalized and threatens the welfare of humanity and the planet.   35. At this present conjuncture, however, what becomes more urgent is the application of a Marxist perspective on the destructive mechanisms of corporate globalization, at present led by the hegemonic military might of the United States and its racializing crusade of an endless "war on terrorism." It might be superfluous to recapitulate the debate between traditional Marxist-Leninists and neo-Marxists such as Immanuel Wallerstein--that would require in itself a separate inquiry. Suffice it to cite one witness to recent international developments. Reflecting on the recent World Conference Against Racism held in Durban, South Africa, immediately before September 11, 2001, Eric Mann noted that to launch the most effective intervention to change history, it is necessary to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the imperialist system: "Right now the U.S. is financing its war against the world by super-exploiting the entire world, subjecting more than three billion people to abject poverty.  In that racism and imperialism are at the heart of the U.S. ideological framework, antiracism and anti-imperialism are the central ideological concepts of contestation, the essence of counterhegemonic political education work" (2002, 220-23). This essay is an attempt to contribute to that revolutionary pedagogical enterprise.

**2. Evaluate the link through offense defense- the alternative solves the case - there is no reason to take a risk on the perm, any marginal net benefit is sufficient to vote neg. And we will read evidence on this point- the combination blunts the alternative and makes solvency impossible**

Herod, typesetter, writer, lecturer, and non-sectarian social critic, 2004 (James, Getting Free 4th ed. Online, [**http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\_g/Strate/GetFre/C.htm**](http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman_g/Strate/GetFre/C.htm))

We cannot destroy capitalism with single-issue campaigns. Yet the great bulk of the energies of radicals is spent on these campaigns. There are dozens of them: campaigns to preserve the forests, keep rent control, stop whaling, stop animal experiments, defend abortion rights, stop toxic dumping, stop the killing of baby seals, stop nuclear testing, stop smoking, stop pornography, stop drug testing, stop drugs, stop the war on drugs, stop police brutality, stop union busting, stop red-lining, stop the death penalty, stop racism, stop sexism, stop child abuse, stop the re-emerging slave trade, stop the bombing of Yugoslavia, stop the logging of redwoods, stop the spread of advertising, stop the patenting of genes, stop the trapping and killing of animals for furs, stop irradiated meat, stop genetically modified foods, stop human cloning, stop the death squads in Colombia, stop the World Bank and the World Trade Organization, stop the extermination of species, stop corporations from buying politicians, stop high stakes educational testing, stop the bovine growth hormone from being used on milk cows, stop micro radio from being banned, stop global warming, stop the militarization of space, stop the killing of the oceans, and on and on. What we are doing is spending our lives trying to fix up a system which generates evils far faster than we can ever eradicate them. Although some of these campaigns use direct action (e.g., spikes in the trees to stop the chain saws or Greenpeace boats in front of the whaling ships to block the harpoons), for the most part the campaigns are directed at passing legislation in Congress to correct the problem. Unfortunately, reforms that are won in one decade, after endless agitation, can be easily wiped off the books the following decade, after the protesters have gone home, or after a new administration comes to power. These struggles all have value and are needed. Could anyone think that the campaigns against global warming, or to free Leonard Peltier, or to aid the East Timorese ought to be abandoned? Single issue campaigns keep us aware of what's wrong, and sometimes even win. But in and of themselves, they cannot destroy capitalism, and thus cannot really fix things. It is utopian to believe that we can reform capitalism. Most of these evils can only be eradicated for good if we destroy capitalism itself and create a new civilization. We cannot afford to aim for anything less. Our very survival is at stake. There is one single-issue campaign I can wholehearted endorse: the total and permanent eradication of capitalism.

# No § Marked 07:10 § perms

The did not make a permutation but in case they try to spin one later

#### Also, Vote for the BEST methodology SANS the permutation.

**Permutations are illegitimate in this instance -**

1. **No predictable stable advocacy – there is no advocacy statement.**
2. **Reciprocity - No check on aff ground means there should be check on negative ground – the aff traditionally has had to be topical and the neg counterplan or counteradvocacy ground was checked by being competitive. This restores fairness.**
3. **Method focus makes competition impossible – methods can often be combined for multiple. Make the affirmative stake their ground and test their advocacy my testing with a different method.**
4. **Err negative on this question – affirmative gets infinite pre-round prep, they have no wiki, and they are not topical, which means that the negative needs some way to test the negative method. Left against left debates are impossible in a world where the aff makes truth statements, leaving the negative to say privilege good or racism good, which is obviously morally reprehensible.**

# OW

**The net ben outweighs and turns the case –**

**Use of disabling stereotypes dehumanizes the disabled. It forms the assumption of disabled people in society. Use of ableist language normalizes exploitation and discrimination that the aff cannot overcome – the only solution is to provide information through discussions of identity. That’s Barnes.**

**Turns the case – leads to the same type of oppression where we exclude in the debate space. Do not let them paint this argument as a racism on them. We are not being racist we just found they were being oppressive as well they are not insulated from causing exploitation.**

**CONCEDED A SOLVENCY TAKE OUT – only cp solves their method now - It destroys their movement – blacks who are disabled are excluded from their movement as well creating hierarchal structure in your performance**

Flow

**Discourse and Education within the debate round helps eliminate Ableism**

Hehir '03 *Thomas Hehir, March 2003 Beyond inclusion: educators' 'ableist' assumptions about students with disabilities compromise the quality of instruction School Administrator, Tom Hehir served as director of the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs from 1993 to 1999. As director, he was responsible for federal leadership in implementing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), http://www.aasa.org/SchoolAdministratorArticle.aspx?id=9262*

Over the past two decades, more and more students with disabilities have been educated for more of the day in regular education classrooms. This movement largely has been positive for most students with disabilities and has supported the broader goal of societal integration for people with disabilities as all children learn that disability is a natural element of human diversity. Further, the inclusion movement in K-12 education has been supported by research that demonstrates that well-implemented inclusionary approaches are superior to fully segregated placement for most disabled students. Ultimately the controversy around inclusion is dysfunctional and we need to shift from the value of inclusion as a practice to the successful implementation of inclusionary education that recognizes the full range of needs of the disability population. Central to moving beyond the debate is the need to focus on the goals of education for students with disabilities. First and foremost our goal should be to maximize the educational development of all disabled students to enable them to fully participate in all aspects of life. However, we need to also recognize that education plays a central role in changing the society disabled students will be entering. For instance, though blind people attain comparable educational levels to nondisabled people, they do not access employment at the same level. The reason for this is likely to be found in "ableism," the pervasive negative attitudes and prejudice in society. We must move beyond inclusion to confront ableism in education. Considerable evidence points to unquestioned ableist assumptions that are handicapping the education of children with disabilities and resulting in educational inequities.

# Ableism Impact – all oppression

**Ableism is a pre-requisite to all oppression**

**Wolbring '08** Gregor Wolbring, Associate Professor Community Rehabilitation and Disability Studies, Past President of Canadian Disability Studies Association and member of the board of the Society for Disability Studies (USA), The politics of Ableism, June 2008,

http://secure.gvsu.edu/cms3/assets/3B8FF455–E590–0E6C–3ED0F895A6FBB287/the\_politics\_of\_ableism.pdf

Ableism is an umbrella ism for other isms such as racism, sexism, casteism, ageism, speciesism, anti–environmentalism, gross domestic product (GDP)–ism and consumerism. One can identify many different forms of Ableism such as biological structure–based Ableism (B), cognition–based Ableism (C), social structure–based Ableism (S) and Ableism inherent to a given economic system (E). ABECS could be used as the Ableism equivalent to the NBICS S&T convergence (Wolbring,2007e).