### case

#### The Monroe doctrine is irrelevant- the US still pursues imperialist policies towards latin america. The aff is a shift away from the embargo, which is the biggest colonial project in latin American history.

#### Their heg link is to the status quo, not to the plan- multilateralism is a shift towards cooperation from hard-power domination that’s kupcahn and pouliot

#### We agree that americans don’t want intervention, that’s why the plan fosters cooperation.

#### Gitmo isn’t an alt cause and the plan overcomes

#### Hotspots focus isn’t racist- we have to shift away from the military industrial complex to

## 2ac – wilderson

### 2ac

#### We agree that white supremacy is bad – but debate is a poor forum and should be used for policy-making- their interpretation is arbitrary and crushes aff ground. Thus, the role of the ballot should be to compare the affirmative versus the status quo or competitive alternative- this has multiple net benefits–

#### First, the debate space creates backlash and fractures coalitions – losers become scapegoats

**Atchison and Panetta 9** (Jarrod, PhD. In Speech Communication.  Edward, Ph.D. in Communication. “Intercollegiate Debate Speech Communication: Historical Developments and Issues for the Future”; The SAGE Handbook of Rhetorical Studies, Pg. 28-9)JFS

**The larger problem with** locating **the "debate as activism" perspective** within the competitive framework **is that it overlooks the** communal **nature of the community problem.** **If each individual debate is a decision about how the debate community should approach a problem, then the losing debaters become collateral damage** in the activist strategy dedicated toward creating community change. **One** frustrating **example** of this type of argument **might include a judge voting for an activist team in an effort to help them reach elimination rounds** to generate a community discussion about the problem. Under this scenario, **the losing team serves as a sacrificial lamb on the altar of community change.** Downplaying the important role of competition and **treating opponents as scapegoats for the failures of the community** **may increase the profile of the** winning team and the community **problem, but it does little to generate the critical coalitions necessary to address the** community **problem, because the competitive focus encourages teams to concentrate on how to beat the strategy with little regard for addressing the** community **problem**. There is no role for competition when a judge decides that it is important to accentuate the publicity of a community problem. An extreme example might include a team arguing that their opponents' academic institution had a legacy of civil rights abuses and that the judge should not vote for them because that would be a community endorsement of a problematic institution. This scenario is a bit more outlandish but not unreasonable if one assumes that each debate should be about what is best for promoting solutions to diversity problems in the debate community. **If the debate community is serious about** generating community **change, then it is more likely to occur outside a traditional competitive debate.** **When a team loses** a debate **because the judge decides that it is better for the community for the other team to win, then they have sacrificed two potential advocates for change** within the community. **Creating change through wins generates backlash through losses**. Some proponents are comfortable with generating backlash and argue that the reaction is evidence that the issue is being discussed. From our perspective, **the discussion that results from these hostile situations is not a productive one where participants seek** to work together for **a common goal**. Instead of giving up on hope for change and agitating for wins regardless of who is left behind, it seems more reasonable that the debate community should try the method of public argument that we teach in an effort to generate a discussion of necessary community changes. Simply put, **debate competitions do not represent the best environment for community change because** it is a competition for a win and **only one team can win any given debate, whereas addressing** systemic century-long community **problems requires a tremendous effort by a great number of people**.

#### Second, fairness- there is two internal links:

#### a. Infinite regression- they could design a massive amount of frameworks that are designed to strategically exclude the affirmative, giving the neg a massive structural bias

#### b. Utopian alternatives- their framework fosters irrational cost-benefit analysis by forcing the aff to compare itself to normative statements that are impossible to challenge

#### Assuming an alternate role of the ballot is the politics of delusion- voting neg doesn’t do anything either, except making the judge feeling good about voting neg without actually taking action against social change

**Gunnell, 86** - Distinguished Professor of Political Science at University of Albany (John G., “Tradition, Interpretation, and Science: Political Theory in the American Academy” pages 351-352)

There may be pointed exceptions; but, on the whole, the radicalism of political theory in the American university is now distinctly academic in both senses of that term. This is due in part to some definite historical factors internal to the evolution of the social sciences in the United States. There is a great distance between the radical activist origins of social science in America (during the twenty years from 1865 to 1885) and contemporary claims about radical social science and critical political theory. What has intervened is academic professionalism. Radical or critical political theory is an idea, largely something that is talked about rather than practiced. It is an academic fantasy and a faint memory which long ago severed any real connection with the objects in their concern. Only a strange academic pretension produces the notion that finding the right philosophical grounding can make academic political theory into something more than it is. Only another pretension implies that depth of concern or other emotive attributes can make this academic practice, as either scholarly production or classroom education, a form of political action or some equivalent to it.

Secured (or imprisoned) within structures of the university and profession, self-ascribed academic radicals posture like actors on a stage. They only descend into the audience within the limits of certain avante-garde productions that would never, in the end, endanger their status as actors or propel the audience beyond the role of spectators. But even the audience consists primarily of other actors. Caught up in this academic theater, they come to believe after a while that the play is the most real thing, that acting is a more noble and efficacious endeavor than the actual practices of life, and that its purity must be maintained. In large measure, of course, this is rhetoric, but not the rhetoric of the street. Political myth is one thing, but mythical politics is another.

While these actors have visions of the world which they wish to reproduce, they have long since lost touch with the concrete character of society, and their world is the product of a script written by others. Maybe the greatest irony is that, while their performances are dedicated to changing the world, they seldom address the specific world in which they reside. They are content to play in a theater whose management and financing is microcosm of the world which they wish to transform, but their vision is too prodigious to be directed toward such small objects. They may complain in passing about the way the players are hired and fired and about the lack of democracy in the company, but they are on the road too frequently to get involved deeply. And, after all, it is their sinecure as permanent members of the troupe that allows them to display their grand gestures without fear of contamination or reprisal.

There are some, usually the more conservative players, who also think that society is a seamless web and that theater changes the world, and they become upset at stage histrionics which mock and criticize life. But much paranoia is surpassed only by the blind faith of those who believe that their performances transform the lives of those with whom they come into contact and that the theater is surely so much a part of life that any real distinction is forced and analytic. It is difficult to know how many have a real passion for the life which they represent on stage or the extent to which their drama is a surrogate for what the world denies them or what they have denied themselves. Probably, many are just actors with feigned and rehearsed concern which they have acquired from their masters and coaches. For them, the play is the thing. For a few, however, these scenes are a vehicle for higher purpose. Sadly, society reserves the theater for their activity, putting them safely away where anything can be said, because everyone knows that it is just a play. Society knows that, in the end, the demands of the profession will keep most from mixing their art with life. Of the few who escape to seek recognition outside the theater, it is safe to assume that they are too inexperienced in the ways of the world to manipulate it and that the worst oppression is simply to ignore them.

This fable is merely a way of making a long story short. But I do want to make it as clear as possible that the apoliticalness and conservatism ascribed to me is charged against a background of alienated and philosophical radicalism that seldom talks about actual practices, let alone to them. My concern with the open society, which Reid takes to reflect attachment to liberal ideology, simply comes from the observation that such a society effectively defuses radicalism. It does so particularly by reserving the university for radical talk, deprived or at least flattened of potential significance through pure tolerance. Reid wishes to pose the question of "the theorist's public responsibility," and this question should be posed. But my brief comments about the open society are less a way of legitimating the abdication of that responsibility than a way of indicating how it cannot be fulfilled in terms of alienated political theory. To couch diagnosis and prescription in this language is to continue to ensure impotence-both because it has no audience and because it obscures the world as much as the conceptual schemes of orthodox social science. It merely substitutes one reified structure for another.

#### Fourth, political simulations are good and foster agency– through roleplaying, we can encourage more effective political actions to remedy their links- that’s Hanghoj

#### Five, Policy involvement is inevitable- we need to proactively engage in the language of policy making for movements to be effective

**Themba-Nixon, 2k** (Makani. Executive Director of The Praxis Project, Former California Staffer, Colorlines. Oakland: Jul 31, 20**00**.Vol.3, Iss. 2; pg. 12)

The flourish and passion with which she made the distinction said everything. Policy is for wonks, sell-out politicians, and ivory-tower eggheads. Organizing is what real, grassroots people do. Common as it may be, this distinction doesn't bear out in the real world. Policy is more than law. It is any written agreement (formal or informal) that specifies how an institution, governing body, or community will address shared problems or attain shared goals. It spells out the terms and the consequences of these agreements and is the codification of the body's values-as represented by those present in the policymaking process. Given who's usually present, most policies reflect the political agenda of powerful elites. Yet, policy can be a force for change-especially when we bring our base and community organizing into the process. In essence, policies are the codification of power relationships and resource allocation. Policies are the rules of the world we live in. Changing the world means changing the rules. So, if organizing is about changing the rules and building power, how can organizing be separated from policies? Can we really speak truth to power, fight the right, stop corporate abuses, or win racial justice without contesting the rules and the rulers, the policies and the policymakers? The answer is no-and double no for people of color. Today, racism subtly dominates nearly every aspect of policymaking. From ballot propositions to city funding priorities, policy is increasingly about the control, de-funding, and disfranchisement of communities of color. What Do We Stand For? Take the public conversation about welfare reform, for example. Most of us know it isn't really about putting people to work. The right's message was framed around racial stereotypes of lazy, cheating "welfare queens" whose poverty was "cultural." But the new welfare policy was about moving billions of dollars in individual cash payments and direct services from welfare recipients to other, more powerful, social actors. Many of us were too busy to tune into the welfare policy drama in Washington, only to find it washed up right on our doorsteps. Our members are suffering from workfare policies, new regulations, and cutoffs. Families who were barely getting by under the old rules are being pushed over the edge by the new policies. Policy doesn't get more relevant than this. And so we got involved in policy-as defense. Yet we have to do more than block their punches. We have to start the fight with initiatives of our own. Those who do are finding offense a bit more fun than defense alone. Living wage ordinances, youth development initiatives, even gun control and alcohol and tobacco policies are finding their way onto the public agenda, thanks to focused community organizing that leverages power for community-driven initiatives. - Over 600 local policies have been passed to regulate the tobacco industry. Local coalitions have taken the lead by writing ordinances that address local problems and organizing broad support for them. - Nearly 100 gun control and violence prevention policies have been enacted since 1991. - Milwaukee, Boston, and Oakland are among the cities that have passed living wage ordinances: local laws that guarantee higher than minimum wages for workers, usually set as the minimum needed to keep a family of four above poverty. These are just a few of the examples that demonstrate how organizing for local policy advocacy has made inroads in areas where positive national policy had been stalled by conservatives. Increasingly, the local policy arena is where the action is and where activists are finding success. Of course, corporate interests-which are usually the target of these policies-are gearing up in defense. Tactics include front groups, economic pressure, and the tried and true: cold, hard cash. Despite these barriers, grassroots organizing can be very effective at the smaller scale of local politics. At the local level, we have greater access to elected officials and officials have a greater reliance on their constituents for reelection. For example, getting 400 people to show up at city hall in just about any city in the U.S. is quite impressive. On the other hand, 400 people at the state house or the Congress would have a less significant impact. Add to that the fact that all 400 people at city hall are usually constituents, and the impact is even greater. Recent trends in government underscore the importance of local policy. Congress has enacted a series of measures devolving significant power to state and local government. Welfare, health care, and the regulation of food and drinking water safety are among the areas where states and localities now have greater rule. Devolution has some negative consequences to be sure. History has taught us that, for social services and civil rights in particular, the lack of clear federal standards and mechanisms for accountability lead to uneven enforcement and even discriminatory implementation of policies. Still, there are real opportunities for advancing progressive initiatives in this more localized environment. Greater local control can mean greater community power to shape and implement important social policies that were heretofore out of reach. To do so will require careful attention to the mechanics of local policymaking and a clear blueprint of what we stand for. Getting It in Writing Much of the work of framing what we stand for takes place in the shaping of demands. By getting into the policy arena in a proactive manner, we can take our demands to the next level. Our demands can become law, with real consequences if the agreement is broken. After all the organizing, press work, and effort, a group should leave a decisionmaker with more than a handshake and his or her word. Of course, this work requires a certain amount of interaction with "the suits," as well as struggles with the bureaucracy, the technical language, and the all-too-common resistance by decisionmakers. Still, if it's worth demanding, it's worth having in writing-whether as law, regulation, or internal policy. From ballot initiatives on rent control to laws requiring worker protections, organizers are leveraging their power into written policies that are making a real difference in their communities. Of course, policy work is just one tool in our organizing arsenal, but it is a tool we simply can't afford to ignore. Making policy work an integral part of organizing will require a certain amount of retrofitting. We will need to develop the capacity to translate our information, data, and experience into stories that are designed to affect the public conversation. Perhaps most important, we will need to move beyond fighting problems and on to framing solutions that bring us closer to our vision of how things should be. And then we must be committed to making it so.

### 2ac – wilderson

#### Permute – do the plan and embrace the alternative – while we don’t perform the 1nc, we still endorse the position of the 1nc as it is not inconsistent with the progressive reform of the affirmative.

#### Our permutation is the best combination of advocacy— The exclusionary policies of whiteness should not be rejected, but reformed. Whiteness as a race is inevitable, but just trying to reject whiteness would be itself a racist move, and worse, it leaves the definition of whiteness up to white supremacists. We should use whiteness as a means to an end that does not tolerate racism. The permutation becomes a way to embrace our advocacy and theirs

**Sullivan, 8** (Shannon Sullivan.Penn State University Charles S. Peirce Society. Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society. Buffalo: 2008. Vol. 44, Iss. 2; pg. 236, 27 pgs)

It is commonly acknowledged today, at least in academic circles, that racial essences do not exist. Racial categories, including whiteness, are historical and political products of human activity, and for that reason the human racial landscape has changed over time and likely will continue to change in the future. In the wake of this acknowledgement, critical race theorists and philosophers of race debate whether whiteness must be eliminated for racial oppression to be ended. Given whiteness's history as a category of violent racial exclusion, eliminativists and "new abolitionists" have argued that it must be abolished. If "whiteness is one pole of an unequal relationship, which can no more exist without oppression than slavery could exist without slaves," then as long as whiteness endures, so does racial oppression.2 In contrast, critical conservationists have claimed even though it has an oppressive past, whiteness could entail something other than racism and oppression. Moreover, since lived existential categories like whiteness cannot be merely or quickly eliminated, white people should work to transform whiteness into an anti-racist category. I count myself as a critical conservationist, but I also acknowledge the force of eliminativist arguments. If whiteness necessarily involves racist oppression, then attempting to transform whiteness into an antiracist category would be a fool's game at best, and a covert continuance of white supremacy at worst. My goal here is not to rehearse the disagreement between new abolitionists and critical conservationists; excellent work explaining the details of their positions already exists.3 I instead approach that disagreement by asking the pragmatic question of whether a rehabilitated version of whiteness can be worked out concretely. What would a non-oppressive, anti-racist whiteness look like? What difference would or could it make to the lives of white and nonwhite people? If the question of how to transform whiteness cannot be answered in some practical detail-if it's not a difference that makes a difference-then critical conservatism would amount to a hopeful, but ultimately harmful abstraction that makes no difference in lived experience and that damages anti-racist movements. In that case, abolitionism would appear to be the only alternative to ongoing white supremacy and privilege. I propose turning to Josiah Royce for help with these issues, more specifically to his essay on "Provincialism."4 This turn is not as surprising as it might initially seem given that Royce wrote explicitly about race in "Race Questions and Prejudices."5 In that essay, Royce issued an antiracist, anti-essentialist challenge to then-current scientific studies of race, especially anthropology and ethnology, which claim to prove the superiority of white people, and he even briefly but explicitly names whiteness a possible threat to the future of humanity. 6 I focus here on "Provincialism," however, because even though the essay never explicitly discusses race, it can help explain the ongoing need for the category of whiteness and implicitly offers a wealth of useful suggestions for how to transform it. "Provincialism" is an exercise in critical conservation of the concept of provincialism, and while not identical, provincialism and whiteness share enough in common that "wise" provincialism can serve as a model for developing "wise" whiteness.7 Royce's essay thus can be of great help to critical philosophers of race wrestling with questions of whether and how to transformatively conserve whiteness. Exploring similarities and differences between wise provincialism and wise whiteness, I use Royce's analyses of provincialism to shed light on why whiteness should be rehabilitated rather than discarded and how white people today might begin living whiteness as an anti-racist category. Comparing Provincialism and Whiteness Race Traitor is a contemporary journal with the motto "Treason to whiteness is loyalty to humanity," and its editor, Noel Ignatiev, makes a scathing case against the critical conservation of whiteness.8 Ignatiev argues that there is no valid white culture to transform. Nor is there any biological rationale for whiteness. In his view, whiteness merely concerns status, privilege, and exclusion and thus cannot form a legitimate, antiracist identity. To suggest that it can, as critical conservationists do, is to encourage white supremacists by giving their worldview intellectual support. Even if critical conservationists do not intend to provide this support, the effect of arguing for the conservation of whiteness is still extremely dangerous. In addition to unintentionally validating white supremacy movements, it tends to divert the energies of well-intentioned white people away from political struggle for racial justice to whiteindulgent racial sensitivity and diversity workshops. According to Ignatiev, what anti-racist movements need is not a white identity that well-intentioned white people can feel good about, but race traitors who are willing to defect from whiteness. The only way for white people to be loyal to the human race is for them to be disloyal to their racial identity. Like critical conservationists regarding whiteness, Royce knows that he faces an uphill battle in convincing many of his interlocutors of the value of provincialism. Put positively, provincialism tends to connote a healthy fondness for and pride in local traditions, interests, and customs. More negatively, it means being restricted and limited, sticking to the narrow ideas of a given region or group and being indifferent, perhaps even violently hostile to the ways of outsiders. What connects these different meanings is their sense of being rooted in a particular cultural-geographical place. In Royce's definition, which emphasizes conscious awareness of this rootedness (an important point to which I will return), a province is a domain that is "sufficiently unified to have a true consciousness of its own unity, to feel a pride in its own ideals and customs, and to possess a sense of its distinction from other[s]." And correspondingly, provincialism is, first, the tendency for a group "to possess its own customs and ideals; secondly, the totality of these customs and ideals themselves; and thirdly the love and pride which leads the inhabitants of a province to cherish as their own these traditions, beliefs and aspirations" (61). Emphasizing unity, love, and pride, Royce's definitions steer away from the negative connotations of provincialism. But in Royce's day- and not much has changed in this regard-it was the negative, or "false," form of provincialism that most often came to people's minds when they thought about the value and effects of the concept. As Royce was writing in 1902, the false provincialism, or "sectionalism," of the United States' Civil War was a recent memory for many of his readers. In the Civil War, stubborn commitment to one portion of the nation violently opposed it to another portion and threatened to tear the nation apart. Provincialism, which appealed to regional values to disunite, had to be condemned in the name of patriotism, which united in the name of a higher good. Royce's rhetorical strategy is to take the challenge of defending provincialism head-on: "My main intention is to define the right form and the true office of provincialism-to portray what, if you please, we may call the Higher Provincialism, -to portray it, and then to defend it, to extol it, and to counsel you to further just such provincialism" (65). Royce readily acknowledges that "against the evil forms of sectionalism we shall always have to contend" (64). But he denies that provincialism must always be evil. Going against the grain of most post-Civil War thinking about provincialism, Royce urges that the present state of civilization, both in the world at large, and with us, in America, is such as to define a new social mission which the province alone, but not the nation, is able to fulfil [sic] . . . .[T]he modern world has reached a point where it needs, more than ever before, the vigorous development of a highly organized provincial life. Such a life, if wisely guided, will not mean disloyalty to the nation. (64) Wisely developed, provincialism need not conflict with national loyalty. The two commitments can-and must, Royce insists-flourish together. Likewise, whiteness need not conflict with membership in humanity as a whole. The two identities can-and must-flourish together. The relationship between provincialism and nationalism, as discussed by Royce, serves as a fruitful model for the relationship of whiteness and humanity, and critical conservationists of whiteness should follow Royce's lead by taking head-on the challenge of critically defending whiteness. Like embracing provincialism, embracing whiteness might seem to be a step backward for the modern world-toward limitation and insularity that breed ignorance, prejudice, and hostility toward others who are different from oneself. Like having a national rather than provincial worldview, seeing oneself as a member of humanity rather than of the white race seems to embody an expansive, outward orientation that is open to others. But there is a "new social mission" with respect to racial justice that whiteness, and not humanity as a whole, can fulfill. Race relations, especially in the United States, have reached a point where humanity needs a "highly organized" anti-racist whiteness, that is, an anti-racist whiteness that is consciously developed and embraced. How then can we (white people, in particular) wisely guide the development of such whiteness so that it does not result in disloyalty to other races and humanity as a whole? Before addressing this question, let me point out two important differences between whiteness and provincialism as described by Royce. First, while Royce calls for the development of a wise form of provincialism, he is able to appeal to existing "wholesome" forms of provincialism in his defense of the concept. He addresses himself "in the most explicit terms, to men and women who, as I hope and presuppose, are and wish to be, in the wholesome sense, provincial," and his demand that "the man of the future . . . love his province more than he does to-day" recognizes a nugget of wise provincialism on which to build (65, 67). The development of wise provincialism does not have to be from scratch. In contrast, it is more difficult to pinpoint a nugget of "wholesome" whiteness to use as a starting point for its transformation. Instances of white people who helped slaves and resisted slavery in the United States, for example, certainly can be found-the infamous John Brown is only one such example-but such people often are seen as white race traitors who represent the abolition, not the transformation of whiteness.9 The task of critically conserving whiteness probably will be more difficult than that of critically conserving provincialism since there is not a straightforward or obvious "right form and true office" of whiteness to extol. Second, true to his idealism, Royce describes both provincialism and its development as explicitly conscious phenomena. Royce notes the elasticity of the term "province"-it can designate a small geographical area in contrast with the nation, or it can designate a large geographical, rural area in contrast with a city (57-58)-but it always includes consciousness of the province's unity and particular identity as this place and not another. Put another way, probably every space, regardless of its size, is distinctive in some way or another. What gives members of a space a provincial attitude is their conscious awareness of, and resulting pride in, that space as the distinctive place that it is. On Royce's model, someone who is provincial knows that she is, at least in some loose way. The task of developing her provincialism, then, is to develop her rudimentary conscious awareness of her province, to become "more and not less selfconscious, well-established, and earnest" in her provincial outlook (67). In contrast-and here lies the largest difference between provincialism and whiteness-many white people today do not consciously think of themselves as members of this (white) race and not another, not even loosely. Excepting members of white militant groups such as the Ku Klux Klan or the Creativity Movement, contemporary white people do not tend to have a conscious sense of unity as fellow white people, nor do they consciously invoke or share special ideals, customs, or common memories as white people. They often are perceived and perceive themselves as raceless, as members of the human species at large rather than members of a particular racial group. This does not eliminate their whiteness or their membership in a fairly unified group. Just the opposite: such "racelessness" is one of the marks and privileges of membership in whiteness, especially middle and upper class forms of whiteness. White people can feel a pride in the ideals and customs of whiteness and possess a sense of distinction from people of other races without much, if any conscious awareness of their whiteness and without consciously identifying those ideals and customs as white. To take one brief example, styles and customs of communication in classrooms tend to be raced (as well as classed and gendered), and white styles of discussion, hand-raising, and turn-taking tend to be treated as appropriate while black styles are seen as inappropriate.10 White students often learn to feel proud and validated by their teachers as good students when they participate in these styles, and this almost always happens without either students or teachers consciously identifying their style (or themselves) as white. Such students appear to belong and experience themselves as belonging merely to a group of smart, orderly, responsible students, not to a racialized group. In the United States and Western world more broadly, unconscious habits of whiteness and white privilege have tended to increase after the end of de jure racism.11 Unlike provincialism as described by Royce, whiteness tends to operate more sub- and unconsciously than consciously. But I do not think that this fact spoils wise provincialism as a fruitful model for wise whiteness. First, and reflecting a basic philosophical disagreement that I have with Royce's idealism, I doubt that provincialism always functions as consciously as Royce suggests it does. The unity, pride, and love that are the hallmarks of provincialism could easily function in the form of unreflective beliefs, habits, preferences, and even bodily comportment. In fact I would argue that many aspects of our provincial loyalties-whatever type of province is at issue-operate on sub- or unconscious levels. In that case, provincialism and whiteness would not be as dissimilar in their operation as Royce's description implies. Second, even if provincialism tends to consciously unify people while whiteness does not, Royce's advice that people should attempt to become more, rather than less self-conscious in their provincialism still applies to white people with respect to their whiteness. Given whiteness's history as a racial category of violent exclusion and oppression, one might think that white people need to focus less on their whiteness, to distance themselves from it. But just the opposite is the case. Given that distance from racial identification tends to be the covert modus operandi for contemporary forms of white privilege, white people who wish to fight racism need to become more intimately acquainted with their whiteness. Rather than ignore their whiteness, which allows unconscious habits of white privilege to proliferate unchecked, white people need to bring their whiteness to as much conscious awareness as possible (while also realizing that complete self-transparency is never achievable) so that they can try to change what it means. But why focus on increased awareness of whiteness simpliciter? I mentioned briefly above that raced styles of communication also tend to be gendered and classed, and even more accurate would be to say that race, gender, class, sexuality, and other significant axes of lived experience transactionally co-constitute one another. Race, including whiteness, is never lived in isolation from these other axes. In the United States, the way that a white person experiences and is impacted by her whiteness likely will vary depending on his/her ethnicity, gender and class in particular, and across the globe, national differences can give whiteness a very different meaning.12 For these reasons, one might wonder why I do not urge white people's increased consciousness of, for example, their Irish-American-whiteness, Southern-woman-whiteness, or lesbian-working-class-whiteness. Such forms of hyphenated whiteness might seem more likely to be sources of consciously felt unity, shared customs, and memory than would generic whiteness. In that case, "wise whiteness" should be read as mere shorthand for an indefinite number of forms of anti-racist whiteness. I agree that one of the functions of the term wise whiteness is to serve as an umbrella for the infinitely rich and complicated ways that white people embody their whiteness. But I think it is important that the term not be understood merely as a bit of convenient shorthand that could be discarded without loss. It has a more substantial function than that of an umbrella, and treating it as mere shorthand risks letting white privilege and white supremacy off the hook too easily. Especially in the case of white ethnicities, insisting that whiteness always be considered in connection with other axes of identity can collapse race into ethnicity and work to deflect attention away white domination and oppression. Whiteness does mean different things for, e.g., Irish-American-whites and Italian-American-whites, and these two groups of white people have different racial histories and therefore at least somewhat different racial presents. But its full meaning is not contained in those different ethnicities. There is something to being white that being contemporarily Irish or Italian alone does not capture. So while whiteness is always transactionally constituted in and through other categories of lived experience, a functional separation of race from those other categories can be and sometimes needs to be made. In practice there is no such thing as whiteness by itself, and yet for particular purposes and because of the tendency of its erasure, it can be useful to focus on whiteness in abstraction from other lived categories. In that pragmatic sense, with the term "wise whiteness" I speak not only of the rehabilitation of a collection of hyphenated forms of whiteness, but also for a rehabilitated whiteness simpliciter. Royce's eloquent pleas on the behalf of provincialism speak to my point about bringing whiteness to as much conscious awareness as possible. As Royce appeals to his readers, he urges, "I hope and believe that you all intend to have your community live its own life, and not the life of any other community, nor yet the life of a mere abstraction called humanity in general" (67). On the same theme, he later compares the problem of wise provincialism with the problem of any individual activity, which admittedly can become narrow and self-centered. Acknowledging this problem, Royce counters, But on the other hand, philanthropy that is not founded upon a personal loyalty of the individual to his own family and to his own personal duties is notoriously a worthless abstraction. We love the world better when we cherish our own friends the more faithfully. We do not grow in grace by forgetting individual duties in behalf of remote social enterprises. Precisely so, the province will not serve the nation best by forgetting itself, but by loyally emphasizing its own duty to the nation . . . . (98) The disappearance of the individual does not well serve larger social enterprises. Those enterprises thrive only if the personal, passionate energies of individuals are poured into them. Large enterprises and institutions tend to become anemic abstractions if they are not rooted in felt individual commitments. Likewise, properly understood, the nation need not be in a competitive relationship with the various communities that it shelters. Loyalty to and love for one's more local connections can be a powerful source of meaningful loyalty to and love for one's nation. In both cases, the same pattern can be detected: rich ties to the smaller entity-the individual or the community-are what sustain meaningful connections to the larger entity-the philanthropic cause or the nation. The two are not necessarily in conflict, as is often thought, and in fact the larger entity would suffer if ties to the smaller entity were cut off. It is useful to anti-racist struggle to think of a similar relationship holding between particular races, including the white race, and humanity at large. While it might initially seem paradoxical, the larger entity of humanity can best be served by people's ties to smaller, more local entities such as their racial groups. A person's racial group is not the only smaller entity that provides the rich existential ties of which Royce speaks-he rightly mentions family, and we could add entities such as one's neighborhood, one's church, mosque or synagogue, and even groups based on one's gender or sexual orientation. But race also belongs in this list of sites of intimate connection that can and often do sustain individual lives and that can support rather than undermine the well being of humanity. Forgetting one's duty to one's particular race in the name of working for racial justice, for example, tends to turn that goal into a remote abstraction. "You cannot be loyal to merely an impersonal abstraction," Royce reminds us.13 Effectively serving the goal of racial justice is more likely to occur if one concretely explores how racial justice could emerge out of loyalty to one's particular race. This claim might not seem objectionable when considering racial groups that are not white. Loyalty to other members of their race has been an important way for African Americans, for example, to further the larger cause of racial justice. Black slaves who helped each other escape their white masters fought against slavery and thus helped humanity as a whole. But the history of whiteness suggests that white people's loyalty to their race not only would not help, but in fact would undermine struggles for racial justice. How could white people serve the larger interests of the human race by being loyal to a race that has oppressed, colonized, and brutalized other races? What possible duties or obligations to their race could white people have, responsibilities that must be remembered if racial justice is to be a concrete, lived goal for white people to work toward? On the one hand, these questions can seem outrageous, even dangerous. Talk of duty to the white race smacks of militarist white supremacist movements, and indeed the first of the Creativity Movement's sixteen commandments in their "White Man's Bible" is that "it is the avowed duty and holy responsibility of each generation to assure and secure for all time the existence of the White Race upon the face of this planet," and the sixth is that "your first loyalty belongs to the White Race."14 Noel Ignatiev's concern about the scholarly validation of white supremacy through the critical conservation of whiteness could not be better placed than here. Temporarily setting aside the dangerous aspect of these questions, they also can seem nonsensical if they do not refer to the goals of white supremacist movements. What antiracist duties, we might ask with some sarcasm, do white people have that must not be forgotten? African Americans and other non-white people might be able to combine loyalty to their racial group with loyalty to humanity, but white people cannot. Their situations are too different to treat their relationships to their races as similar. Those relationships are asymmetrical, which means that white people's loyalty to the human race, including racial justice for all its members, conflicts with loyalty to whiteness. Loyalty to humanity would seem to require white people to be race traitors. On the other hand, these questions present a needed challenge to white people who care about racial justice. Rather than rhetorically or sarcastically, the questions can be asked in the spirit of Royce's call for each "community [to] live its own life, and not the life of any other community, nor yet the life of a mere abstraction called humanity in general" (67). For white people to fight white supremacy and white privilege does not mean for them to attempt to shed their whiteness and become members of the human species at large. Attempting to become raceless by living the life of an abstraction called humanity merely cultivates a white person's ignorance of how race, including whiteness, and racism inform her habits, beliefs, desires, antipathies, and other aspects of her life. It does not magically eliminate her white privilege for even if she succeeds in thinking of herself as a raceless member of humanity, she likely will continue to be identified and treated as white, even if unreflectively or unconsciously, by others. By allowing her white privilege to go unchecked in this way, a white person's living the life of abstract humanity actually tends to increase, not reduce her racial privilege. To increase the chances of reducing her racial privilege, she must resist the temptation to see herself as raceless and instead figure out what it could mean for her to live her own life as a racialized person. Living as a racialized, rather than abstract person does not mean attempting to take on a different race. Attempting to take on a different race implicitly acknowledges that whiteness is problematic, and it can seem to be an expression of respect for non-white people. But it often is no better a response to white privilege than attempting to shed one's whiteness. This is because a white person's taking on the habits, culture, and other aspects of another race often is an expression of ontological expansiveness, which is a habit of white privileged people to treat all spaces-whether geographical, existential, linguistic, cultural, or other-as available for them to inhabit at their choosing.15 Appropriating another race in this way thus is closer to imperialist colonialism than a gesture of respect. For this reason, white people need to stop trying to flee the responsibilities and duties that come with being white and figure out how to live their own racialized life, not the life of another race. Once they no longer ignore or attempt to flee their whiteness, they can then ask how work for racial justice fits with their duties and responsibilities as a white person and how they might live their own anti-racist white life. Three "Evils" Eliminated by Wise Whiteness Royce lists three specific problems in modern American life that cannot be solved without wise provincialism. His discussion of these "evils," as Royce calls them, also illuminates "evils" that a wise form of whiteness could help meliorate. The first evil is the neglect of and disruption to a community when people are only loosely associated with it and do not invest in, care about, or have a significant history with it. Royce argues that this problem is growing in frequency and significance as people are increasingly mobile, changing their residency multiple times over their lifetime and often moving great distances from where they were born and raised. This means that communities are increasingly dealing with a large number of newcomers who do not (yet) have an intimate, caring connection to the new place they inhabit. This is "a source of social danger, because the community needs well-knit organization" (73). Provincialism helps these newcomers care for their new home, and a wise provincialism does so without generating any hostility toward either other provincial communities or larger social bodies such as the nation. In a similar fashion, when white people who care about racial justice have virtually no conscious or deliberate affiliation with their whiteness, the meaning and effect of whiteness is left to happenstance or, more likely, is determined by white supremacist groups. Royce's primary concern is the dissolution of communities through neglect, and if well intentioned white people do not care about, invest in, or acknowledge a significant history with their whiteness, then whiteness will be neglected. But unlike provincial communities, whiteness does not necessarily unravel or wither away because of simple neglect by anti-racist white people. Its neglect by anti-racists whites instead leaves it wide open for racist white groups to develop. Like a garden, whiteness can easily grow tough weeds of white supremacy if it is not wisely cultivated. The evil of abandoning whiteness, allowing white supremacists to make of it whatever they will, can be mitigated by a wise form of whiteness. In practice, this means that white people who care about racial justice need to educate newcomers to whiteness-namely, white children-to be loyal to and care about their race. While Royce's comments about the problem of newcomers due to increased geographical mobility do not apply directly to whiteness,16 white children can be thought of as newcomers to the community of whiteness who do not (yet) have an intimate connection to their race or know how to cultivate and care for it. Here again is an instance in which white supremacists have been allowed to corner the market on whiteness: almost all explicit reflection and writing on how to raise white children as white has been undertaken by groups such as the Ku Klux Klan, World Church of the Creator, and Stormfront.17 The association is so tight that the mere suggestion of educating white children in their whiteness is alarming to many people. But educating white children about their whiteness need and should not mean educating them to be white supremacists. A wise form of whiteness would help train the developing racial habits of white children in anti-racist ways. 18 Royce calls the second problem addressed by provincialism that of "the leveling tendency of recent civilization" (74), but more accurate, I think, would be to characterize the problem as one of monotonous sameness. Royce is concerned that the increase of mass communication means that people all over the nation, indeed the globe, are reading the same news stories, sharing the same ideas, fashions, and trends, and more and more imitating one another. The rich diversity of humankind, the independence of the small manufacturer, and distinctiveness of the individual are being absorbed into a vast, impersonal social order. A wise provincialism is not wholly opposed to these tendencies. There is great value in large groups of people coming to understand each other across their differences. But, Royce argues, there often also is great value to be found in their differences, and those differences ought to be allowed to thrive. A wise provincialism helps protect the variety of different places and communities so that they are not forced to be identical with each other. In a similar way, wise whiteness helps preserve racial differences without treating people of various races as wholly alien to each other and thus incapable of understanding each other across their differences. As Lucius Outlaw asks, "Why is it, after thousands of years, that human beings are not all 'light khaki' instead of exhibiting the variety of skin tones (and other features) more or less characteristic of various populations called races?"19 The answer, according to Outlaw, is not merely that racism and invidious ethnocentrism have worked to establish inviolable boundaries between white and non-white races. It also is that different races are "the result of bio-cultural group attachments and practices that are conducive to human survival and well-being."20With W.E.B. Du Bois, Outlaw argues that racial differences can enrich everyone and that even if racism disappeared tomorrow, we should want discernibly distinct races to continue to exist.21 The baby need not be thrown out with the bathwater. The rich variety of human racial and ethnic cultures need not be eliminated to eliminate racism and invidious ethnocentrism. A wise whiteness also would caution, however, that white people's appreciation for racial diversity and variety also can be an insidious form of whiteness in disguise. Too often, celebrations of multiculturalism and racial diversity function as a smorgasbord of racial difference offered up for (middle-to-upper class) white people's consumption and enjoyment. They do this by acknowledging some differences while simultaneously concealing others. It is very easy for white people to recognize and even celebrate racial difference in the form of different food, dress, and cultural customs. It tends to be much more difficult for them to recognize racial difference in the form of economic, educational, and political inequalities. Royce's criticism of the leveling tendencies of modern culture does not explicitly depoliticize the issue, and he does mention that variety is needed particularly to counter "the purely mechanical carrying-power of certain ruling social influences," an example of which is the hegemony of white culture (76). But given the tendency of white (middle-to-upper class, in particular) people to see whiteness as cultureless and boring and thus want to spice it up by dabbling in other, "exotic" cultures, care must be taken that appreciation of diversity is not sanitized through an avoidance of the history and present of white privilege. When that happens, appreciation of plurality and diversity tend to become a covert vehicle for white ontological expansiveness. In contrast, a wise whiteness values and thus transactionally conserves different races, as Outlaw does, without depoliticizing the meaning of those differences. The third evil discussed by Royce, the mob spirit, occurs when all individual judgment has been given up and a person becomes totally absorbed in a large social mass. Without discriminating individuals, the crowd or mob is psychologically vulnerable to a strong leader, idea, or even a song that enflames emotions and leads people to act in ways they ordinarily would not act. This danger is closely related to the one of sameness for behind the two dangers lay the same phenomenon: that of wide, inclusive human sympathy (92-93). Openness to and sharing in the lives and the feelings of others is not always a positive event, Royce cautions us. Undiscriminating sympathy can lend support to base absurdities as easily as to noble kindness, and as such sympathy is more of a neutral base for psychological development than an automatic good to be ubiquitously cultivated. Under certain conditions-conditions that Royce thinks are increasingly present in the modern world-wide, inclusive sympathy for others can become not only monotonous, but also dangerous (95). Loss of the small-the particular, the local, the individual-as it is absorbed into the large is something to resist, and a wise provincialism helps prevent that loss Royce's concern about the mob spirit does not directly speak to problems faced by a wise whiteness.22 But in this concern we can see the streak of organic individualism that runs through Royce's work, which can tell us something important about the relationships of white individuals to their race. Royce's legendary concern for community does not sacrifice or dissolve the individual into the larger whole. Just as false forms of provincialism set up a false opposition between provincialism and nationalism, false forms of individualism set up a false opposition between individualism and community or social causes. That kind of individualism fails because of its "failure to comprehend what it is that the ethical individual needs," which is a cause greater than the individual that she can passionately serve (38). Here is where Royce's individualism is distinctive: it insists that real individuality is found through personal choice of a larger cause that one loyally serves, not through endless insistence that one is a single individual with personal initiative. This insistence is empty if never acted upon, leaving the so-called autonomous individual lost and floundering. "Be an individual," Royce urges exasperatedly, "[b]ut for Heaven's sake, set about the task."23 To be a real individual, a person needs something larger than herself to be a part of. And as communities of meaning, racial groups historically have developed as one of those things. In Lucius Outlaw's words, racial and ethnic identification in part "develop[ed] as responses to the need for life-sustaining and meaningful acceptable order of various kinds (conceptual, social, political)."24 Human beings need to create conceptual, social, political and other structures, including individual and social identities, to give their lives meaning and purpose. While Outlaw talks about this need in terms of order and Royce speaks of it in terms of a cause to devote one's self to, both point to an existential need that racial identity, including whiteness, can serve and historically has served. And they both suggest that **a theory of racial justice that ignores this need will *not be effective in practice*.**

#### Their links are all to the status quo and not to the plan, we agree that the US has in the past tried to engage in acts to depose the Cuban government. However, in a shift away from those policies, the plan repeals the embargo as a way to recognize the equality between Cuba and the United States

#### Complete rejection of institutional logic of civil society crushes anti-white supremacy politics.

Kimberle **CRENSHAW** Law @ UCLA **’88** RACE, REFORM, AND RETRENCHMENT: TRANSFORMATION AND LEGITIMATION IN ANTIDISCRIMINATION LAW 101 Harv. L. Rev. 1331 L/N

Questioning the Transformative View: Some Doubts About Trashing

The Critics' product is of limited utility to Blacks in its present form. The implications for Blacks of trashing liberal legal ideology are troubling, even though it may be proper to assail belief structures that obscure liberating possibilities. Trashing legal ideology seems to tell us repeatedly what has already been established -- that legal discourse is unstable and relatively indeterminate. Furthermore, trashing offers **no idea of how to avoid the negative consequences of engaging in reformist discourse** or how to work around such consequences. Even if we imagine the wrong world when we think in terms of legal discourse, **we must nevertheless exist in a present world** where legal protection has at times been a blessing -- albeit a mixed one. The fundamental problem is that, although Critics criticize law because it functions to legitimate existing institutional arrangements, it is precisely this legitimating function that has made law **receptive** **to** certain demands in this area. The Critical emphasis on deconstruction as the vehicle for liberation leads to the conclusion that engaging in legal discourse should be avoided because it reinforces not only the discourse itself but also the society and the world that it embodies. Yet Critics offer little beyond this observation. Their focus on delegitimating rights rhetoric seems to suggest that, once rights rhetoric has been discarded, there exists a more productive strategy for change, one which does not reinforce existing patterns of domination. Unfortunately, **no such strategy has yet been articulated**, and it is difficult to imagine that racial minorities will ever be able to discover one. As Frances Fox Piven and Richard Cloward point out in their [\*1367] excellent account of the civil rights movement, popular struggles are a reflection of institutionally determined logic and a challenge to that logic. 137 **People can only demand change in ways that reflect the logic of the institutions that they are challenging.** 138 Demands for change that do not reflect the institutional logic -- that is, demands that do not engage and subsequently reinforce the dominant ideology -- will probably be **ineffective**. 139 The possibility for ideological change is created through the very process of legitimation, which is triggered by crisis. Powerless people can sometimes trigger such a crisis by challenging an institution internally, that is, by using its own logic against it. 140 Such crisis occurs when powerless people force open and politicize a contradiction between the dominant ideology and their reality. The political consequences [\*1368] of maintaining the contradictions may sometimes force an adjustment -- an attempt to close the gap or to make things appear fair. 141 Yet, because the adjustment is triggered by the political consequences of the contradiction, circumstances will be adjusted only to the extent necessary to close the apparent contradiction.

This approach to understanding legitimation and change is applicable to the civil rights movement. Because Blacks were challenging their exclusion from political society, the only claims that were likely to achieve recognition were those that reflected American society's institutional logic: legal rights ideology. Articulating their formal demands through legal rights ideology, civil rights protestors exposed a series of contradictions -- the most important being the promised privileges of American citizenship and the practice of absolute racial subordination. Rather than using the contradictions to suggest that American citizenship was itself illegitimate or false, civil rights protestors proceeded as if American citizenship were real, and demanded to exercise the "rights" that citizenship entailed. By seeking to restructure reality to reflect American mythology, Blacks relied upon and ultimately benefited from politically inspired efforts to resolve the contradictions by granting formal rights. Although it is the need to maintain legitimacy that presents powerless groups with the opportunity to wrest concessions from the dominant order, it is the very accomplishment of legitimacy that forecloses greater possibilities. In sum, the potential for change is both created and limited by legitimation.

#### The embargo upholds a tourism industry grounded in racism

St. Martin & Thompson, 3 – (Amy St. Martin is a Laurie Crumpacker scholar graduate of the Gender and Cultural Studies M.A. Program at Simmons College. Bucky Thompson is a Professor of Sociology at Simmons College. “Cuban Tourism: In The Name of Progressive Politics" Race, Gender & Class Vol. 10 No. 4, 2003) //NG

The Cuban government's encouragement of tourism partly reflects Cuba`s need for foreign capital made necessary by the decades-long blockade levied against the country by the United States. Ironically, progressive support of Cuba manifested in this travel is undermining Cuba's struggle against racism and patriarchy. In this article the authors examine how, under the guise of supporting a socialist country, tourism has become an embargo-era means of upholding inequalities. The authors open up the discourse of the romance with the Cuban revolution that many progressives play out in their imaginations and a Cuban nationalist discourse, both of which make it difficult to talk openly about internal hierarchies. This becomes another privilege of tourists, in adopting closed discourses on Cuban nationalism, as they do not have to live with the realities that extend from colonization and the U.S. occupations, or the present day policies that produce social inequalities for many Cubans. The authors conclude with suggestions of ways that progressive delegations can break rather than re-inscribe patterns of domination.¶ ...the map to a new world is in the imagination, in what we see in our third eyes, rather than in the desolation that surrounds us now. - (Kelley, 200212-3)¶ I recently returned from Cuba where I traveled with a delegation of people affiliated with the Committees of Correspondence, a communist based organization that was founded by Manning Marable, Charlene Hunter, Angela Davis, and other Black and white communists who left or were kicked out of the Communist Party in the early l990s.\* It did my spirit good to be in a location where being part of a socialist group with communist ties opened doors. In my travels and study in Brazil, Mexico, and South Africa-even in progressive contexts in those countries-I had never before felt the welcome that a socialist-communist affiliation brought in Cuba. At the same time, I have never experienced such a layering of contradictions as I did traveling there. These mind-splitting contradictions speak volumes to the important question raised by humanitarian aid scholar, Angela Raven-Roberts: where do issues of race and power manifest themselves globally and how are these issues often veiled or encoded in other terms (200l)?¶ In this article we present three anecdotes from my recent trip to Cuba that illuminate ways that privilege and domination manifest themselves in the tourist industry. We draw upon these anecdotes in the tradition of qualitative sociologists, critical race legal theorists, and multiracial feminist theorists, whose analyses of power and capitalism are often revealed in their description of specific, embodied scenes (Blee, 1991; Collins, 1998; Du Bois, 1903; Ferber, 1988; Matsuda, 1996; Moraga & Anzaldlia, 1983; Rollins, 1985; Romero, 1997; Williams, 1991). These three anecdotes spring from oppressive demonstrations of power, control and white supremacist practices rooted in Spanish colonization, subsequent US occupations, and the embargo (1963-present). When viewed together, these scenes reflect dangerous ways in which tourism undermines Cuban economic strategies, supports prostitution, and undercuts Afro-Cubans' struggles against racism. Under the guise of supporting a socialist country-and often in the name of progressive politics-tourism has become an embargo-era means in which white supremacy and patriarchy are upheld.¶ The history of the external domination of Cuba set the stage for racism and sexism that are currently being reinscribed through a dramatic surge in tourism (from the 1990s and continuing). While this escalation has come from tourists across the globe, our primary focus in this article is US tourism in Cuba. This surge reflects Cuba's need for U.S. dollars since it is close to impossible to obtain crucial supplies, mainly technological and medical, without U.S. money. The influx also reveals progressives' long standing ailiation with, respect for, and romance with the Cuban Revolution. In fact, there has long been a symbolic umbilical cord between Cuba and progressives outside of Cuba.¶ The emotional, psychic and political connections between progressives and Cuban history and culture are multiple. As novelist and scholar Andrea O'Reilly Herrera writes, "Cuba has become a kind of real and imagined place or space...the object of imagination and desire" (2001 zxxix). Cuba is the home of a rich Afro-Cuban culture-Santeria, the Rumba, jazz, hip-hop, folk music, and art infused with African symbolism. This creativity has both been a source of spiritual and political sustenance in Cuba and has resonated deeply with what historian and cultural theorist Robin Kelley has termed the "Black radical imagination" (2002). Cuban exile Rafael Saumell writes, "...the true Cuban democratic revolution occurred in music. One might compare it to the freedom African American musicians enjoyed in creating the jazz tradition, as opposed to the freedom they lacked at a time when civil rights were nonexistent for them"¶ Cuban-U.S. political ties also reflect progressives' admiration for early achievements of the Cuban Revolution. In 1961 the Cuban people reduced illiteracy from 74% to close to zero with an each-one, teach-one campaign that remains unparalleled. For those activists in the U.S. concerned with literacy, from those who founded liberation schools in the 1960s to those who have worked on literacy campaigns in rural and urban areas since, the Cuban literacy movement has long been a model. Cuba is a country that boasts no homelessness, no malnutrition, universal healtl1 care and education. The country has earned the right to such pride even as it struggles with the reality that many people do not have the money to buy aspirin and other simple necessities.¶ Cuba is also the home for over 90 U.S. political exiles including Assata Shakur, a former Black Panther caught in the COINTELPRO snare in the early 1970s who, in 1979, was freed from prison and was able to tind safe haven in Cuba (Cleaver, 2001:125; James, 2003, 115; Perkins, 2000). For prison activists in the U.S. Assata Shakur's escape from prison remains a proud achievement, particularly since New Jersey governor Christine Todd Whitman's 1998 attempt to extradite Shakur was unsuccessful. All those achievements and more are now long standing and have been institutionalized, despite U.S. attempts to undermine these humanistic goals at every turn.¶ The place Cuba has earned in the U.S. progressive public imagination is a key reason for the rise in Cuban tourism. This influx is what Jorge Fornet, Director of the Center for Literary Research, a government institute in Havana, has called a "real invasion from Berkeley. Duke, Tulane, Harvard" (Lawrence 2000:A46). Delegations have been sponsored by state legislators, Cross-Cultural Solutions, the Cuba Outreach Program, Global Exchange, church groups, lay groups, and community groups. This industry is a small but important antidote to the U.S. embargo (although it remains another twisted version of the NAFTA imposed dynamic that has made it much easier to trade consumer goods across borders while making it harder-often to the point of risking one's life-for those who make the goods to travel to the U.S).¶ Tourist travel to Cuba brings capital to the country but also carries with it economic and skin privilege that, in often unexamined ways, mediates consciousness. Many tourists have the privilege to continue the romance with the Cuban Revolution without confronting how U.S. imperialism has shaped Cuban options. The privileges that white supremacy has endowed many progressives traveling to Cuba from the U.S. and Europe has allowed many to sideline conversations around internal conflicts in Cuba. White Cubans' privilege--much of which is unnamed-certainly does little to undermine white tourists' privilege. In fact, white Cuban privilege can easily justify white tourists' racial domination when they see whiteness upheld in the name of socialism in Cuba, Tourists' investment in preserving their image of a socialist country blurs their ability to see racist, sexist, and heteronormative practices.¶ The term "progressive" itself can be manipulated to encode white supremacy, as it is used under the idea that one is for positive and active change within a specific realm of space, but what constitutes positive change can be vague and misleading. The potentially misleading nature of adopting a title to one's intentions, such as "progressive" or "liberal" may allow for a person`s privileges to implicitly operate, which prevents them from understanding their power. The term "progressive" can even relieve them of the responsibility for the racism they reinscribe as a tourist. Anne Braden, in The Wall Between, affirms that many white Americans, who call themselves liberals, operate their privileges to "develop a gradualist approach because they think that when a step is taken too fast it inflames the passions of those who oppose" change (l958:293). She contends that "liberal" is a broad term that can cover those who oppose oppression to those who oppose oppression in certain circumstances, usually when it would not affect their privileged way of life. Therefore, a careful consideration around the way privileges operate under the guise of "progressive" or "liberal" politics is necessary to combat the contradictions that tourists in this industry bring to their idealized image of Cuba. Story One It is New Year's Eve, 2000 and a big party has been planned at a Havana hotel where the Committees of Correspondence delegation and other tourists, mostly from the U.S. and Europe, are staying. Among the elaborate plans for the party are tables and tables of food, already conspicuous consumption in a country that, a decade ago, in the Special Period, had to reduce a family's allotment of rice, beans, and other food essentials so substantially that the average citizen lost between ten and twenty pounds. Cubans tend to be a lean, proud people who are careful not to waste and are cognizant, in a bodily way, of the impact of upholding socialist values in a world bent on capitalist accumulation. I see tables of food and tourists who are, seemingly, joyful. Cubans, including a busload of Cuban workers asked to work this special event, are working the New Year's Eve shift away from their families. And then I see the coup-de-grace, a six-foot high, domed display of food at the center of each table complete with big, red, whole-bodied lobsters. Dozens of lobsters are dangling on these displays for all to see, to enjoy, to smile at. My stomach turns.¶ All lobster and beef are prohibited for the general population of Cuban citizens, Lobster and beef are considered luxury items. Lobsters-decadence on display on New Year’s Eve-are plentiful at this celebration where all of the visible workers, the people at the front desk and the wait staff, are light-skinned while the women cleaning the rooms are several shades darker. Lobsters are on display and the hotel's hiring practices reflect colorism as our delegation spent the week being driven around in big, cushiony, air-conditioned, media-stocked buses. We were driven from place to place while we passed, on every street, lines and lines of people, young and old, people in pressed shirts and work clothes, waiting for the bus, packed to overflowing with people. They were waiting for old buses, way too-full buses, waiting, in line, in groups, on street corners, typically for one and sometimes two hours each day.¶ The contradictions are multiple when tourists who travel to Cuba to support a socialist country then eat the very foods-in front of Cubans-that Cubans, for politically sound reasons, do not eat. The history of the logic behind such prohibitions reveals why eating lobster and beef flies in the face of supporting Cuban strategies of maintaining economic autonomy. This history of food prohibition has its origins during the Spanish colonization. Cuba's emergence with its sugar production in the North American trade market, in the nineteenth century, became increasingly more demanding as the market became more profitable. bouis A. Perez Ir., in On Becoming Cuban: Identity, Nationality, and Culture, documents how "Cuban success was very much derived from a strategy of specialization: production for export at the expense of production for consumption, increasingly to the exclusion of other products, eventually to the exclusion of other markets" (l999:l7). The revenue that accrued from Cuba's exports, such as sugar and then later lobster, various other seafood products, beef, citrus fruits, and many dairy products trumped the food preferences and choices of general Cuban individuals and families.¶ Though most Cubans go without eating lobster, today the revenue from exporting more than 10,000 tons of lobster to Japan, France, Spain, and Canada allows Cuba to import 20 tons of powdered milk yearly for the equally distributed and rationed consumption of the population (Castro 1988). ln a 1988 speech given to the Cuban people, President Fidel Castro made specilic reference to certain compromises that had to be made within the food distribution industry since the embargo against Cuba. Castro stressed, "We can say that lobster is not part of the Cuban diet, but our children do not have rickets; we do not have children starving to death. Every child in this country drinks a liter of milk daily, which is why Cuba today is one of the healthiest countries in the world" (1988).¶ Cuba is a country that has had to make due with the situation that is imposed upon them, a country whose people take pride in many of the choices they have had to make for the betterment of all Cubans. This is a counter ideological practice to that of the structure of capitalism that creates and sustains poverty, hunger, malnutrition, illiteracy, etc. Capitalism prides itself on world economic power. Maintaining oppression becomes the means for sustaining the wealth of the dominant few, whereas socialism takes pride in bringing up communities together as a whole in the attempt to foster a more egalitarian society. According to this socialist logic, giving up the pleasure of consuming part of an expansive lobster industry in Cuba, for the sake of importing other products that would feed and nourish more bodies, is the pride of the Cubans. Eating lobster, then, becomes the privilege of those tourists who sit at tables with elaborately constructed centerpieces of that sweet meat and other prohibited food exports. Story two I am visiting Old Havana with three others from the delegation-a white, long-time communist activist, a white divorce lawyer from New York, an African American female professor from Vassar, and me, a white US born female professor. We have met a twenty-two-year-old Afro-Cuban whose English is probably as good as my Spanish. We eat and see the sites together. He reminds me a lot of my twelve-year-old Black son--sweet, tall and thin, easy with strangers. For a split second, the African American woman of the group slips off in search of a bathroom, just long enough for the Cuban police to swoop in on the young Afro-Cuban man. They begin to harass him, demand his identification papers, and assume that he had been bothering us, no matter what we say to the contrary.¶ Obviously, the police had been watching us, probably assuming that the Afro-Cuban young man and the Black (American) woman were related and both Cuban. Once the Black woman stepped away, our group became three white Americans and one Afro-Cuban man. We witness racial profiling on this gorgeous winter day. They are harassing him, getting ready to put him in the police car. I am unable to stop any of this frightening affair with my limited Spanish. Finally, an Afro-Cuban woman and her family approach the police. Thinking quickly on her feet, this woman tells the police that this young man is her relative. She argues with the light skinned, olive-skinned, and then darkskinned police officers insisting that they are practicing racial profiling. Finally, the police give the young man back his identification. The family who intervened does not want to explain it all to us. They wanted to spend a pleasant weekend day as a family. We go of? shaken. I think, silently, that it is lucky that I had decided not to take my U.S.-raised-of-Trinidadian-descent son with me to Cuba.¶ Had we intervened with the police in the United States as much as we did in Cuba, we might have been arrested or harassed ourselves. In Cuba, the discussion did eventually tum the scene around. Regardless, the police policy is all in the name of tourism. Protecting the tourists. Protecting the white people. Audre horde (1988) has long asked, what is being done in your name? In my name, for the sake of the flow of capital, at my son's, this young Cuban's expense? When a few of us asked one of the key officials who works with Ricardo Alarcon (the President of the Cuban National Assembly of People`s Power) about this incident and racial profiling in general, she said that some of the Cuban police are young and insufficiently trained. But, she explains, they soon learn that such practices are unacceptable. Her response becomes another version of neoconservative individualism that continues to deny state-sanctioned racism in the Cuba and the United States. These racist practices are intimately tied to Cuba's history of colonialism. Its history continues to be relived though modern bodies.¶ Cubans continue to live, prosper, and struggle with the history of their ancestors and their ancestor's ancestors. James Baldwin contends,¶ ¶ The great force of history comes from the fact that we carry it within us, are unconsciously controlled by it in many ways, and history is literally present in all that we do. It could scarcely be otherwise, since it is to history that we owe our frames of reference, our identities, and our aspirations (l998:32l).¶ It is this living history of all Cubans and those whose predecessors have enacted imperial projects upon Cuba that continue to influence ideological assumptions of white supremacy. Thus, white European and American tourists traveling in Cuba today, extend from a lineage of hegemonic notions of privilege and power that they may continue to foster, consciously and unconsciously, within the postcolonial context of socialist Cuba. Cubans, also carrying their colonial history of in justices, may continue to harbor not only the awareness of historic struggles but also a deep-set oppression that was implemented and augmented by colonial forces. Frantz Fanon, in Black Skin White Masks (1967), intimately describes the internalized oppression of colonized individuals and communities that takes its form in the young child, with the encounters and identifications of colonial texts produced through the scope of whiteness. In the process of the id and ego's development from infant to adolescent, the child looks outward to seek images that s/he can identify with, however, the images that the child mirrors have been influenced or constructed through a white colonial lens that is imbedded with ideologies of power, through which social oppressions manifest. Therefore, if Cubans identify with images from imperial sources (from Spain or the US), they may inadvertently identify with a white man’s perception of the colored "other" that has colonized them (or aimed to Americanize them)-a hateful, unloving, devastating identification.¶ The core of racial oppression is a more traumatic and destructive whole-bodied process than a superficial discourse of oppression would have one comprehend. The child, within her/his colonized society, has the alarming potential to grow up despising its difference apart from the dominant colonial forces, in turn emulating white supremacist practices against themselves and their people. It is these attitudes that have benefited the cause of white supremacy during Cuba's colonial past, that structure the individual’s mind to carry out its own destruction; a practice to colonize the souls of natives.¶ When witnessing a case of racial profiling in the twenty-first century of an Afro-Cuban by Cuban police, in the name of catering to and protecting white tourists, we see how history lives within us and is passed down through the generations. Moreover, we see the extent to which oppression is a corruption of the entire personhood as one has the potential to adopt practices of racism and white supremacy that inadvertently carry out the desires and interests of those who hold global economic power. bell hooks, in Talking Back: Thinking Feminist Thinking Black, speaks to the adoption of racist practices by people of color on people of color explaining that,¶ ‘White supremacy' is a much more useful term for understanding the complicity of people of color in upholding and maintaining racial hierarchies that do not involve force (i.e. slavery, apartheid) .... The term ‘white supremacy' enables us to recognize not only that black people are socialized to embody the values and attitudes of white supremacy, but that [people of color] can exercise "˜white-supremacist control' over other black people (l989: 1 13).¶ Using the term "white supremacy" not only signifies the agency from which these practices extend. It may also allow a conscious spectator of racist practices and contradictions in a socialist context to connect the adoption and internalization of white supremacist values and attitudes to Cuba’s colonial history.¶ It is this colonial history, embedded in Cubans, Spaniards, and Americans, that becomes apparent in the demonstrations of racism, power and privilege within the present day Cuban context. It is this colonial history coupled with the contact and negotiations with a growing global capitalism that sustains those vexed contradictions. They are being observed in the socialist country, that had focused intentions on the advancement of all its people who are now forced to compromise with that global capitalism in a way that caters to white American and European tourists and feeds into white supremacist practices.

#### Social death entrenches pessimism and despair and wilderson is reductionist

Brown 09 [Vincent Brown is Professor of History and of African and African-American Studies at Harvard University. AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, DECEMBER 2009 <http://history.fas.harvard.edu/people/faculty/documents/brown-socialdeath.pdf> //liam]

Slavery and Social Death was widely reviewed and lavishly praised for its erudition and conceptual rigor. As a result of its success, social death has become a handy general deﬁnition of slavery, for many historians and non-historians alike. But it is often forgotten that the concept of social death is a distillation from Patterson’s breathtaking survey—a theoretical abstraction that is meant not to describe the lived experiences of the enslaved so much as to reduce them to a least common denominator that could reveal the essence of slavery in an ideal-type slave, shorn of meaningful heritage. As a concept, it is what Frederick Cooper has called an “agentless abstraction” that provides a neat cultural logic but ultimately does little to illuminate the social and political experience of enslavement and the struggles that produce historic transformations. Indeed, it is difﬁcult to use such a distillation to explain the actual behavior of slaves, and yet in much of the scholarship that followed in the wake of Slavery and Social Death, Patterson’s abstract distillates have been used to explain the existential condition of the enslaved. Having emerged from the discipline of sociology, “social death” ﬁt comfortably within a scholarly tradition that had generally been more alert to deviations in patterns of black life from prevailing social norms than to the worldviews, strategies, and social tactics of people in black communities. Together with Patterson’s work on the distortions wrought by slavery on black families, “social death” reﬂected sociology’s abiding concern with “social pathology”; the “pathological condition” of twentieth-century black life could be seen as an outcome of the damage that black people had suffered during slavery.University of Chicago professor Robert Park, the grand-pe`re of the social pathologists, set the terms in 1919: “the Negro, when he landed in the United States, left behind almost everything but his dark complexion and his tropical temperament.” 8 Patterson’s distillation also conformed to the nomothetic imperative of social science, which has traditionally aimed to discover universal laws of operation that would be true regardless of time and place, making the synchronic study of social phenomena more tempting than more descriptive studies of historical transformation. Slavery and Social Death took shape during a period when largely synchronic studies of antebellum slavery in the United States dominated the scholarship on human bondage, and Patterson’s expansive view was meant to situate U.S. slavery in a broad context rather than to discuss changes as the institution developed through time. Thus one might see “social death” as an obsolete product of its time and tradition, an academic artifact with limited purchase for contemporary scholarship, were it not for the concept’s reemergence in some important new studies of slavery. 9 WIDELY ACKNOWLEDGED AS AMONG themost onerous of social institutions, slavery has much to tell us about the way human beings react to oppression. At the same time, the extreme nature of the institution naturally encourages a pessimistic view of the capacity for collective agency among subjugated people. As a result, trends in the study of slavery, as with the study of dominancemore generally, often divide between works that emphasize the overwhelming power of the institution and scholarship that focuses on the resistant efforts of the enslaved. In turn, this division frames a problem in the general understanding of political life, especially for the descendants of the powerless. It might even be said that these kinds of studies form different and opposing genres—hopeful stories of heroic subalterns versus anatomies of doom—that compete for ascendance. In recent years, if the invocation of Patterson’s “social death” is any indication, the pendulum seems to have swung decidedly toward despair.

#### Social death is theoretically bankrupt – doesn’t provide an alternative and their hard ontological descriptions make fatalism inevitable –

Bâ'11  (teaches film at Portsmouth University (UK). He researches ‘race’, the ‘postcolonial’,  diaspora,  the  transnational  and  film  ‘genre’,  African  and  Caribbean cinemas  and film festivals)

(Saër Maty, The US Decentred, Cultural Studies Review, volume 17 number 2 September 2011)

A few pages into Red, White and Black, I feared that it would just be a matter of time before Wilderson’s black‐as‐social‐death idea and multiple attacks on issues and scholars he disagrees with run (him) into (theoretical) trouble. This happens in chapter two, ‘The Narcissistic Slave’, where he critiques black film theorists and books. For example, Wilderson declares that Gladstone Yearwood’s Black Film as Signifying Practice (2000) ‘betrays a kind of conceptual anxiety with respect to the historical object of study— ... it clings, anxiously, to the film‐as‐text‐as‐legitimate‐ object of Black cinema.’ (62) He then quotes from Yearwood’s book to highlight ‘just how vague the aesthetic foundation of Yearwood’s attempt to construct a canon can be’. (63) And yet Wilderson’s highlighting is problematic because it overlooks the ‘Diaspora’ or ‘African Diaspora’, a key component in Yearwood’s thesis that, crucially, neither navel‐gazes (that is, at the US or black America) nor pretends to properly engage with black film. Furthermore, Wilderson separates the different waves of black film theory and approaches them, only, in terms of how a most recent one might challenge its precedent. Again, his approach is problematic because it does not mention or emphasise the inter‐connectivity of/in black film theory. As a case in point, Wilderson does not link Tommy Lott’s mobilisation of Third Cinema for black film theory to Yearwood’s idea of African Diaspora. (64) Additionally, of course, Wilderson seems unaware that Third Cinema itself has been fundamentally questioned since Lott’s 1990s’ theory of black film was formulated. Yet another consequence of ignoring the African Diaspora is that it exposes Wilderson’s corpus of films as unable to carry the weight of the transnational argument he attempts to advance. Here, beyond the US‐centricity or ‘social and political specificity of [his] filmography’, (95) I am talking about Wilderson’s choice of films. For example, Antwone Fisher (dir. Denzel Washington, 2002) is attacked unfairly for failing to acknowledge ‘a grid of captivity across spatial dimensions of the Black “body”, the Black “home”, and the Black “community”’ (111) while films like Alan and Albert Hughes’s Menace II Society (1993), overlooked, do acknowledge the same grid and, additionally, problematise Street Terrorism Enforcement and Prevention Act (STEP) policing. The above examples expose the fact of Wilderson’s dubious and questionable conclusions on black film. Red, White and Black is particularly undermined by Wilderson’s propensity for exaggeration and blinkeredness. In chapter nine, ‘“Savage” Negrophobia’, **he writes: The philosophical anxiety of Skins is all too aware that through the Middle Passage, African culture became Black ‘style’ ... Blackness can be placed and displaced with limitless frequency and across untold territories, by whoever so chooses. Most important, there is nothing real Black people can do to either check or direct this process** ... Anyone can say ‘nigger’ because anyone can be a ‘nigger’. (235)7 Similarly, in chapter ten, ‘A Crisis in the Commons’, Wilderson addresses the issue of ‘Black time’. Black is irredeemable, he argues, because, at no time in history had it been deemed, or deemed through the right historical moment and place. In other words, the black moment and place are not right because they are ‘the ship hold of the Middle Passage’: ‘the most coherent temporality ever deemed as Black time’ but also ‘the “moment” of no time at all on the map of no place at all’. (279) Not only does **Pinho’s more mature analysis expose this point as** preposterous (see below), **I also wonder what Wilderson makes of the countless historians’ and sociologists’ works on slave ships, shipboard insurrections and/during the Middle Passage,8 or of groundbreaking jazz‐studies books on cross‐cultural dialogue** like The Other Side of Nowhere (2004). Nowhere has another side, but once Wilderson theorises blacks as socially and ontologically dead while dismissing jazz as ‘belonging nowhere and to no one, simply there for the taking’, (225) there seems to be no way back. **It is therefore hardly surprising that Wilderson ducks the need to provide a solution or alternative to both his sustained bashing of blacks and anti‐ Blackness**.9 Last but not least, Red, White and Black ends like a badly plugged announcement of a bad Hollywood film’s badly planned sequel: ‘How does one deconstruct life? Who would benefit from such an undertaking? The coffle approaches with its answers in tow.’ (340)

#### The only coherent rubric is to maximize number of lives saved

**Greene 2010** – Associate Professor of the Social Sciences Department of Psychology Harvard University (Joshua, Moral Psychology: Historical and Contemporary Readings, “The Secret Joke of Kant’s Soul”, [www.fed.cuhk.edu.hk/~lchang/material/Evolutionary/Developmental/Greene-KantSoul.pdf](http://www.fed.cuhk.edu.hk/~lchang/material/Evolutionary/Developmental/Greene-KantSoul.pdf), WEA)

What turn-of-the-millennium science is telling us is that human moral judgment is not a pristine rational enterprise, that our moral judgments are driven by a hodgepodge of emotional dispositions, which themselves were shaped by a hodgepodge of evolutionary forces, both biological and cultural. Because of this, it is exceedingly unlikely that there is anyrationallycoherentnormativemoral theory that can accommodateourmoral intuitions. Moreover, anyone who claims to have such a theory, or even part of one, almost certainly doesn't. Instead, what that person probably has is a moral rationalization.

It seems then, that we have somehow crossed the infamous "is"-"ought" divide.  How did this happen? Didn't Hume (Hume, 1978) and Moore (Moore, 1966) warn us against trying to derive an "ought" from and "is?" How did we go from descriptive scientific theories concerning moral psychology to skepticism about a whole class of normative moral theories? The answer is that we did not, as Hume and Moore anticipated, attempt to derive an "ought" from and "is." That is, our method has been inductive rather than deductive. We have inferred on the basis of the available evidence that the phenomenon of rationalist deontological philosophy is best explained as a rationalization of evolved emotional intuition (Harman, 1977).

Missing the Deontological Point  
I suspect that rationalist deontologists will remain unmoved by the arguments presented here. Instead, I suspect, they will insist that I have simply misunderstoodwhatKant and like-minded deontologistsare all about. Deontology, they will say, isn't about this intuition or that intuition. It's not defined by its normative differences with consequentialism. Rather, deontology is about taking humanity seriously. Above all else, it's about respect for persons. It's about treating others as fellow rational creatures rather than as mere objects, about acting for reasons rational beings can share. And so on (Korsgaard, 1996a; Korsgaard, 1996b).This is, no doubt, how many deontologists see deontology. But this insider's view, as I've suggested, may be misleading. The problem, more specifically, is that it defines deontology in terms of values that are notdistinctivelydeontological, though they may appear to be from the inside. Consider the following analogy with religion. When one asks a religious person to explain the essence of his religion, one often gets an answer like this: "It's about love, really. It's about looking out for other people, looking beyond oneself. It's about community, being part of something larger than oneself." This sort of answer accurately captures the phenomenology of many people's religion, but it's nevertheless inadequate for distinguishing religion from other things. This is because many, if not most, non-religious people aspire to love deeply, look out for other people, avoid self-absorption, have a sense of a community, and be connected to things larger than themselves. In other words, secular humanists and atheists can assent to most of what many religious people think religion is all about. From a secular humanist's point of view, in contrast, what's distinctive about religion is its commitment to the existence of supernatural entities as well as formal religious institutions and doctrines. And they're right. These things really do distinguish religious from non-religious practices, though they may appear to be secondary to many people operating from within a religious point of view.  
In the same way, I believe that most of the standard deontological/Kantian self-characterizatons fail to distinguish deontology from other approaches to ethics. (See also Kagan (Kagan, 1997, pp. 70-78.) on the difficulty of defining deontology.) It seems to me that consequentialists, as much as anyone else, have respect for persons, are against treating people asmereobjects, wish to act for reasons that rational creatures can share, etc. A consequentialist respects other persons, and refrains from treating them as mere objects, by counting every person's well-beingin the decision-making process. Likewise, a consequentialist attempts to act according to reasons that rational creatures can share by acting according to principles that give equal weight to everyone's interests, i.e. that are impartial. This is not to say that consequentialists and deontologists don't differ. They do. It's just that the real differences may not be what deontologists often take them to be.  
What, then, distinguishes deontology from other kinds of moral thought? A good strategy for answering this question is to start with concrete disagreements between deontologists and others (such as consequentialists) and then work backward in search of deeper principles. This is what I've attempted to do with the trolley and footbridge cases, and other instances in which deontologists and consequentialists disagree. If you ask a deontologically-minded person why it's wrong to push someone in front of speeding trolley in order to save five others, you will getcharacteristically deontological answers. Some will betautological: "Because it's murder!"Others will be more sophisticated: "The ends don't justify the means." "You have to respect people's rights." But, as we know, these answers don't really explain anything, because if you give the same people (on different occasions) the trolley case or the loop case (See above), they'll make the opposite judgment, even though their initial explanation concerning the footbridge case applies equally well to one or both of these cases. Talk about rights, respect for persons, and reasons we can share are natural attempts to explain, in "cognitive" terms, what we feel when we find ourselves having emotionally driven intuitions that are odds with the cold calculus of consequentialism. Although these explanations are inevitably incomplete, there seems to be "something deeply right" about thembecause they give voice to powerful moral emotions. But, as with many religious people's accounts of what's essential to religion, they don't really explain what's distinctive about the philosophy in question.

#### And ignoring consequences is complicit with the evils of the status quo

**Issac 02** – Professor of political science at Indiana-Bloomington, Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life, PhD from Yale (Jeffery C., Dissent Magazine, Vol. 49, Iss. 2, “Ends, Means, and Politics,” p. Proquest)

As a result, the most important political questions are simply not asked. It is assumed that U.S. military intervention is an act of "aggression," but no consideration is given to the aggression to which intervention is a response. The status quo ante in Afghanistan is not, as peace activists would have it, peace, but rather terrorist violence abetted by a regime--the Taliban--that rose to power through brutality and repression. This requires us to ask a question that most "peace" activists would prefer not to ask: What should be done to respond to the violence of a Saddam Hussein, or a Milosevic, or a Taliban regime? What means are likely to stop violence and bring criminals to justice? Calls for diplomacy and international law are well intended and important; they implicate a decent and civilized ethic of global order. But they are also vague and empty, because they are not accompanied by any account of how diplomacy or international law can work effectively to address the problem at hand. The campus left offers no such account. To do so would require it to contemplate tragic choices in which moral goodness is of limited utility. Here what matters is not purity of intention but the intelligent exercise of power.

Power is not a dirty word or an unfortunate feature of the world. It is the core of politics. Power is the ability to effect outcomes in the world. Politics, in large part, involves contests over the distribution and use of power. To accomplish anything in the political world, one must attend to the means that are necessary to bring it about. And to develop such means is to develop, and to exercise, power. To say this is not to say that power is beyond morality. It is to say that power is not reducible to morality. As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one's intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with "good" may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of "good" that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

#### Their understanding of modernity perpetuates the myth of the model minority – turns case

**McGowand and Lindgren** 06 (Miranda Oshige McGowan\* and James Lindgren\*\* - Northwestern School of Law, 2006, “TESTING THE “MODEL MINORITY MYTH”, http://www.law.northwestern.edu/lawreview/v100/n1/331/lr100n1lindgren-mcgowan.pdf) //MD

Professor Neil Gotanda writes that white **Americans are deeply wedded to the idea that “racism directed against Asian Americans is** insignificant or does not exist.”34 Professor Gotanda argues that **the model minority stereotype solidifies this belief,** 35 **though there is evidence that discrimination against Asian Americans persists today.** For example, **Asian Americans make less money than whites with the same educational attainment.**36 Moreover, **Asian Americans have been the victims of a large number of hate crimes.** Some have argued that the incidence of such crimes may be rising, though pinning down the precise nature and extent of the problem is difficult.37 Asian critical scholars argue, however, that **the model minority stereotype creates the impression that Asian Americans could not possibly suffer pervasive discrimination, “much less the kind that spawns physical violence.”**38 Indeed, Asian critical scholars report that **Asian Americans’ complaints of discrimination are** sometimes **met with derision.**39 C. The Model Minority Stereotype Reinforces the American Dream and Implicitly Blames Other Minority Groups for Their Problems “Whites love us because we’re not black,” one Asian critical scholar contends.40 Asian critical scholars charge that Asian Americans’ supposed success is used “to demoralize or to anger other minority groups and disadvantaged people.”41 Professor Chew charges that the model minority stereotype tells other minorities that if they “work hard, have certain values, and are reasonably intelligent” they, too, “can be successful.”42 Alternatively, lack of success means that **“**they are lazy, their values are misplaced,” orthey lack “the inherent capabilities to succeed.”43 In other words, “failures are under their control—even perhaps their **choice.”**44 Other racial minorities would succeed if only they would follow the example of Asian Americans and channel the energy they spend complaining into hard work.45

**The myth of the model minority internal link turns their exclusion claims**

**McGowand and Lindgren 06 (**Miranda Oshige McGowan\* - , and James Lindgren\*\* - , 2006, “TESTING THE “MODEL MINORITY MYTH”, http://www.law.northwestern.edu/lawreview/v100/n1/331/lr100n1lindgren-mcgowan.pdf) //MD

Asian critical scholars are increasingly concerned that **the model minority stereotype is designed to divide and conquer racial minority groups.** They argue that **it sows resentment and jealousy among groups in order to dissipate racial minorities’ collective power** when America becomes “majority minority.”54 If, as Professor Wu contends, **the fate of America’s minority groups depends on their unity and collective efforts,** 55 Asian critical scholars ought to worry if **the model minority stereotype “fosters resentment from non-Asian minorities who are impliedly faulted as less than model.”**56 If this charge is true, **the model minority stereotype takes on a sinister cast. Asian critical scholars have branded it a “disingenuous stereotype” “created to perpetuate the dominance of white Americans.”**57 **The stereotype by “establishing a racial hierarchy that denies the reality of Asian American oppression, while accepting that of other racial minorities and poor whites.”**58 Model minority status is a poisonous prize, because **the stereotype will “only be wielded in defense of the racial status quo.”**59Whites will remain on top, African Americans on the bottom, with Asian Americans sandwiched in between.

**White supremacy isn’t a monolithic root cause---proximate causes determined through empirics are more likely---and their arg shuts off productive debate over solutions   
Shelby 7** – Tommie Shelby, Professor of African and African American Studies and of Philosophy at Harvard, 2007, We Who Are Dark: The Philosophical Foundations of Black Solidarity  
  
Others might challenge the distinction between ideological and structural causes of black disadvantage, on the grounds that we are rarely, if ever, able to so neatly separate these factors, an epistemic situation that is only made worse by the fact that these causes interact in complex ways with behavioral factors. These distinctions, while perhaps straightforward in the abstract, are difficult to employ in practice. For example, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for the members of a poor black community to determine with any accuracy whether their impoverished condition is due primarily to institutional racism, the impact of past racial injustice, the increasing technological basis of the economy, shrinking state budgets, the vicissitudes of world trade, the ascendancy of conservative ideology, poorly funded schools, lack of personal initiative, a violent drug trade that deters business investment, some combination of these factors, or some other explanation altogether. Moreover, it is notoriously difficult to determine when the formulation of putatively race-neutral policies has been motivated by racism or when such policies are unfairly applied by racially biased public officials. There are very real empirical difficulties in determining the specific causal significance of the factors that create and perpetuate black disadvantage; nonetheless, it is clear that these factors exist and that justice will demand different practical remedies according to each factor's relative impact on blacks' life chances. We must acknowledge that our social world is complicated and not immediately transparent to common sense, and thus that systematic empirical inquiry, historical studies, and rigorous social analysis are required to reveal its systemic structure and sociocultural dynamics. There is, moreover, no mechanical or infallible procedure for determining which analyses are the soundest ones. In addition, given the inevitable bias that attends social inquiry, legislators and those they represent cannot simply defer to social-scientific experts. We must instead rely on open public debate—among politicians, scholars, policy makers, intellectuals, and ordinary citizens—with the aim of garnering rationally motivated and informed consensus. And even if our practical decision procedures rest on critical deliberative discourse and thus live up to our highest democratic ideals, some trial and error through actual practice is unavoidable. These difficulties and complications notwithstanding, a general recognition of the distinctions among the ideological and structural causes of black disadvantage could help blacks refocus their political energies and self-help strategies. Attention to these distinctions might help expose the superficiality of theories that seek to reduce all the social obstacles that blacks face to contemporary forms of racism or white supremacy. A more penetrating, subtle, and empirically grounded analysis is needed to comprehend the causes of racial inequality and black disadvantage. Indeed, these distinctions highlight the necessity to probe deeper to find the causes of contemporary forms of racism, as some racial conflict may be a symptom of broader problems or recent social developments (such as immigration policy or reduced federal funding for higher education).

### sexton

#### Sexton mischaracterizes the social relations that they use for their impact claims

**Spickard 9** - UC, Santa Barbara (Paul Amalgamation Schemes: Antiblackness and the Critique of Multiracialism (review) American Studies - Volume 50, Number 1/2, Spring/Summer 2009, pp. 125-127 ajones)

One of the major developments in ethnic studies over the past two decades has been the idea (and sometimes the advocacy) of multiraciality. From a theoretical perspective, this has stemmed from a post-structuralist attempt to deconstruct the categories created by the European Enlightenment and its colonial enterprise around the world. From a personal perspective, it has been driven by the life experiences in the last half-century of a growing number of people who have and acknowledge mixed parentage. The leading figures in this scholarly movement are probably Maria Root and G. Reginald Daniel, but the writers are many and include figures as eminent as Gary Nash and Randall Kennedy. A small but dedicated group of writers has resisted this trend: chiefly Rainier Spencer, Jon Michael Spencer, and Lewis Gordon. They have raised no controversy, perhaps [End Page 125] because their books are not well written, and perhaps because their arguments do not make a great deal of sense. It is not that there is nothing wrong with the literature and the people movement surrounding multiraciality. Some writers and social activists do tend to wax rhapsodic about the glories of intermarriage and multiracial identity as social panacea. A couple of not-very-thoughtful activists (Charles Byrd and Susan Graham) have been coopted by the Gingrichian right (to be fair, one must point out that most multiracialists are on the left). And, most importantly, there is a tension between some Black intellectuals and the multiracial idea over the lingering fear that, for some people, adopting a multiracial identity is a dodge to avoid being Black. If so, that might tend to sap the strength of a monoracially-defined movement for Black community empowerment. With Amalgamation Schemes, Jared Sexton is trying to stir up some controversy. He presents a facile, sophisticated, and theoretically informed intelligence, and he picks a fight from the start. His title suggests that the study of multiraciality is some kind of plot, or at the very least an illegitimate enterprise. His tone is angry and accusatory on every page. It is difficult to get to the grounds of his argument, because the cloud of invective is so thick, and because his writing is abstract, referential, and at key points vague. For Sexton (as for the Spencers and Gordon) race is about Blackness, in the United States and around the world. That is silly, for there are other racialized relationships. In the U.S., native peoples were racialized by European intruders in all the ways that Africans were, and more: they were nearly extinguished. To take just one example from many around the world, Han Chinese have racialized Tibetans historically in all the ways (including slavery) that Whites have racialized Blacks and Indians in the United States. So there is a problem with Sexton's concept of race as Blackness. There is also a problem with his insistence on monoraciality. For Sexton and the others, one cannot be mixed or multiple; one must choose ever and only to be Black. I don't have a problem with that as a political choice, but to insist that it is the only possibility flies in the face of a great deal of human experience, and it ignores the history of how modern racial ideas emerged. Sexton does point out, as do many writers, the flawed tendencies in multiracial advocacy mentioned in the second paragraph above. But he imputes them to the whole movement and to the subject of study, and that is not a fair assessment. The main problem is that Sexton argues from conclusion to evidence, rather than the other way around. That is, he begins with the conclusion that the multiracial idea is bad, retrograde, and must be resisted. And then he cherry-picks his evidence to fit his conclusion. He spends much of his time on weaker writers such as Gregory Stephens and Stephen Talty who have been tangential to the multiracial literature. When he addresses stronger figures like Daniel, Root, Nash, and Kennedy, he carefully selects his quotes to fit his argument, and misrepresents their positions by doing so. Sexton also makes some pretty outrageous claims. He takes the fact that people who study multiracial identities are often studying aspects of family life (such as the shaping of a child's identity), and twists that to charge them with homophobia and nuclear family-ism. That is simply not accurate for any of the main writers in the field. The same is true for his argument by innuendo that scholars of multiraciality somehow advocate mail-order bride services. And sometimes Sexton simply resorts to ad hominem attacks on the motives and personal lives of the writers themselves. It is a pretty tawdry exercise. That is unfortunate, because Sexton appears bright and might have written a much better book detailing his hesitations about some tendencies in the multiracial movement. He might even have opened up a new direction for productive study of racial commitment amid complexity. Sexton does make several observations that are worth thinking about, [End Page 126] and surely this intellectual movement, like any other, needs to think critically about itself. Sadly, this is not that book.

### rodriguez

#### Their Rodriguez evidence is far too radical – we agree that progressive movements only cause incremental change and that it is a constant struggle – but it is asinine to say that

#### History proves that non-statist movements, such as their alternative, are total failures.

**Grossberg**, **92** - Professor of Communications at the University of Illinois (Lawrence, We Gotta Get Out of This Place, p. 390-391)

But this would mean that the Left could not remain outside of the systems of governance. It has sometimes to work with, against and with in bureaucratic systems of governance. Consider the case of Amnesty International, an immesely effective organization when its major strategy was (similar to that of the Right) exerting pressure directly on the bureaucracies of specific governments. In recent years (marked by the recent rock tour), it has apparently redirected its energy and resources, seeking new members (who may not be committed to actually doing anything; memebership becomes little more than a statement of ideological support for a position that few are likely to oppose) and public visibility. In stark contrast, the most effective struggle on the Left in recent times has been the dramatic (and, one hopes continuing) dismantling of apartheid in South Africa. It was accomplished by mobilizing popular pressure on the institutions and bureaucracies of economic and governmental institutions and it depended on a highly sophisticated organizational structure. The Left too often thinks that it can end racism and sexism and classism by changing people's attitudes and everyday practices (e.g. the 1990 Black boycott of Korean stores in New York). Unfortunately, while such struggles may be extremely visible, they are often less effective than attempts to move the institutions (e.g.,banks, taxing structures, distributors) which have put the economic realtions of black and immigrant populations in place and which condition people's everyday practices. The Left needs institutions which can operate within the system of governance, understanding that such institutions are the mediating structures by which power is actively realized. It is often by directing opposition against specific institutions that power can be challenged. The Left assumed for some time now that, since it has so little access to the apparatuses of agency, its only alternative is to seek a public voice in the media through tactical protests. The Left does in fact need more visibility, but it also needs greater access to the entire range of apparatuses of decision making power. Otherwise the Left has nothing but its own self-righteousness. It is not individuals who have produced starvation and the other social disgraces of our world, although it is individuals who must take responsibility for eliminating them. But to do so, they must act with organizations, and within the systems of organizations which in fact have the capacity (as well as responsibility) to fight them.

#### Even if reformism is flawed, it is still a viable method of social change – don’t let the perfect be the enemy of the good

**Grossberg, 92** - Morris Davis Professor of Communication Studies at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (Lawrence, “We Gotta Get Out of this Place: Popular Conservatism and Postmodern Culture”, page 388-389)

﻿The demand for moral and ideological purity often results in the rejection of any hierarchy or organization. The question-can the master's tools be used to tear down the master's house?-ignores both the contingency of the relation between such tools and the master's power and, even more importantly, the fact that **there may be no other tools available.** Institutionalization is seen as a repressive impurity within the body politic rather than as a strategic and tactical, even empowering, necessity. It sometimes seems as if every progressive organization is condemned to recapitulate the same arguments and crisis, often leading to their collapse. 54 For example, Minkowitz has described a crisis in Act Up over the need for efficiency and organization, professionalization and even hierarchy,55 as if these inherently contradicted its commitment to democracy. This is particularly unfortunate since Act Up, whatever its limitations, has proven itself an effective and imaginative political strategist. The problems are obviously magnified with success, as membership, finances and activities grow. This refusal of efficient operation and the moment of organization is intimately connected with the Left's appropriation and privileging of the local (as the site of democracy and resistance). This is yet another reason why structures of alliance are inadequate, since they often assume that an effective movement can be organized and sustained without such structuring. The Left needs to recognize the necessity of institutionalization and of systems of hierarchy, without falling back into its own authoritarianism. It needs to find reasonably democratic structures of institutionalization, even if they are impure and compromised.

#### Their social location arguments are a manifestation of identity politics that flips the script of expertism while refusing to get its hands dirty changing the macro structures it identifies as evil

**Wilcken 1995** – department of anthropology, Goldsmiths College, University of London (Patrick, “The intellectuals, the media, and the gulf war”, Critique of Anthropology 15.37, credit to LDK)

The expanded university may have professionalized academics, but it also diversified the student population4 and pluralized academic discourse. The new wave of identity politics, the liberating of once-suppressed voices of ethnic minorities, women and homosexuals may have been some of the more tangible gains in the academy since the 1960s, **but at what cost?** Why are these supposedly popular concerns so often **couched in incomprehensible jargon?** Why has mass culture’s movement into the academy given rise to a style of theorizing that is **inaccessible to the general public?** Who stands to gain from such highly specialized analysis?’ One could argue that feminist and race discourse, in the long run have not so much alleviated the plight of America’s burgeoning underclass but instead have **created ’professional spokesperson[s] for the seemingly permanently aggrieved’** (Steele in Robbins, 1993: 3). Another consequence has been that **problems which can only be addressed by looking at power relations on a global scale have been obscured in favour of micro-politics**.

Even if, as Edward Said claims, the university still offers western intellectuals an almost ideal space for research, this factor alone does not guarantee that this freedom will produce desirable results (Said, 1994). For Said, it is not the academy, but the ethos of professionalism that subverts oppositional voices, producing the highly specialized nine-to-fiver, working within the dominant paradigm in the pay of higher powers (Said, 1994). But Said falsely divides intrinsically related factors. The intellectuals of today, hoping to appeal to an audience outside their peers, are not isolates negotiating their way through distracting specialist fields, warding off compromises offered by the publishing industry and the media. They are part of a wider system, a system which to a large degree defines their roles and the audience they reach. Specialization is often a precondition for advancement; jargon-ridden language a prerequisite for publishing and state patronage an unavoidable fact of life. Given this situation, being above the fray, unattached and independent, has distinct advantages. But more importantly, this set of relationships between academics and institutions, publishing houses and contributors and the mainstream media and commentators, unevenly distributes political opinion. The specialist carries disproportionate weight; the dissenting generalist is denied significant access to the wider public. **Radical thought lives on, but largely within the private domain of the academic journal**.

Continued…

Anthropological careers may never have been closely connected with broader political issues, but recent developments ensure that **private theorizing will be kept more and more out of the public domain**. Part of the problem may well be the media themselves which, as Ahmed points out, require the expert ’who can comment on the larger picture’ whereas the anthropologist prefers to focus on the ’fine-grained ethnography’ (1991: 2).

But another part of the problem is surely in the institutional conditions in which anthropologists work which affect both the focus of their efforts and the theoretical frameworks they employ. A growing institution that produces ever smaller subdivisions of knowledge, and malleable theoretical frameworks with which to accommodate these specialist interests, stands less and less of a chance of **communicating its ideas outside of its own walls**. There is some security in this position for the anthropologist, but **ossification may be the price.**

This paper has related the institutional changes in the universities to a decline in dissident voices in the public domain. The expansion of the universities has given rise to a class of institutionalized specialists whose interrelations have had a relativizing effect producing flexible theoretical positions. This process has brought with it some gains: the activating of new and diverse voices in the academy, the realization of the plurality of interests that binds any society together and the highlighting of cultural differences that exist within societies and around the world. But **the losses have been heavy**. Claims that pliant theoretical positions have democratized intellectual discourse by pluralizing it **cannot be sustained in the face of an international event like the Gulf War**. Society may well be composed of different voices, overlapping identities and divergent world views, but this does little to explain the fact that **a tiny elite in the space of a few months managed to place half a million troops in Saudi Arabia**. In this case, for all intents and purposes, the USA did not act like an amorphous body but as a monolithic world power which can **send its massive military forces at a moment’s notice anywhere in the world** without even consulting congress.

A review of commentary on the Gulf War showed that dissenting opinion was concentrated in a handful of low-circulation radical journals (e.g. New Left Review, Dissent, Lies of Our Times), while **the academic response in the mainstream media was largely conservative**. A look at anthropology’s reaction found that the discipline, because of its specialized character could not adequately explain the event. This is not to say that specialist pursuits are not important or even crucial to our understanding, but the institutional precedence of the specialist, even in cases that have quite general implications, has seriously affected the way such events are viewed.

In the wake of Foucault, much has recently been written about the relationships between knowledge and power, but **little has been said about the connections between knowledge and powerlessness**. In some ways, looking at reactions to the Gulf War showed how restricted and impotent the dissenting generalist is when faced with **institutional structures which militate against such voices being heard**. But the power/knowledge nexus lives on in the form of the nascent professional classes who, as Gouldner (1979) points out, are reproducing themselves faster than any other class (in the US at least). Their claims to power will be based firmly on their monopoly of specialized knowledge, not on an oppositional ideological stand. Their fragmentation and institutionalization has further consolidated their positions in a late capitalist society which is not characterized by ongoing ethical soul searching, but rather, to use C. Wright Mills’ expression, by a bureaucratic system of ’organized irresponsibility’ (1953:149).