### 1NC

**A. Interpretation**

**The United States federal government is the actor defined by the resolution, not individual debaters**

US Gov Official Website 2009

http://www.usa.gov/Agencies/federal.shtml

U.S. Federal Government **The three branches of U.S. government—legislative, judicial, and executive—carry out governmental power and functions.** View a complete diagram (.PDF) of the U.S. government's branches.

#### Presidential WPA doesn’t extend beyond the “theater of war” – excludes domestic

NAME: Colby P. Horowitz 13 BIO: \* J.D. Candidate, 2014, Fordham University School of Law. Captain, U.S. Army, participating in the Funded Legal Education Program. April, 2013 Fordham Law Review 81 Fordham L. Rev. 2853 LENGTH: 27336 words SYMPOSIUM: THE GOALS OF ANTITRUST: NOTE: CREATING A MORE MEANINGFUL DETENTION STATUTE: LESSONS LEARNED FROM HEDGES V. OBAMA. Lexis

1. The Limited Theory of Presidential War Powers

Justice Black's majority opinion in Youngstown expressed a limited view of presidential war powers. This view has also been called a "formalist approach." n115 Justice Black stated that "the President's power, if any, to issue the order must stem either from an act of Congress or from the [\*2869] Constitution itself." n116 Justice Black held that the seizure of the steel mills lacked express statutory authority, and there was no "act of Congress ... from which such a power [could] fairly be implied." n117

Justice Black also determined that the President had exceeded his constitutional powers. He explained that the President's Commander-in-Chief power was limited to the "theater of war," which did not include domestic production facilities. n118 Additionally, the seizure did not fall under the President's power to execute the laws, because Justice Black saw it as lawmaking and not execution. n119

#### Targeted killing must be specifically targeted, beyond possibility of arrest, authorized by senior head of government, and participating in hostilities

Philip Alston 11 John Norton Pomeroy Professor of Law, New York University School of Law. The author was UN Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions from 2004 until 2010.¶ 2011¶ Harvard National Security Journal¶ 2 Harv. Nat'l Sec. J. 283¶ ARTICLE: The CIA and Targeted Killings Beyond Borders. Lexis. Gender edited

At the other end of the definitional spectrum is a five-part definition proposed by Gary Solis. For there to be a targeted killing: (i) there must be an armed conflict, either international or non-international in character; (ii) the victim must be specifically targeted; (iii) [s]he must be "beyond a reasonable possibility of arrest"; (iv) the killing must be authorized by a senior military commander or the head of government; (v) and the target must be either a combatant or someone directly participating in the hostilities. n42 But whereas Gross seeks to use a human rights-based definition, Solis proposes one which is unsuitable outside of international humanitarian law.

**B. Violation—the affirmative does not defend the implementation of a topical plan.**

**C. Vote negative**

**1. Limits—their interpretation kills limits because it creates a strategic incentive to disregard the resolution. If teams can get away with being non-topical, there’s no reason to defend the resolution. Limits are good:**

**A. Decision-making—having a limited topic with equitable ground is necessary to foster decision-making and clash**

Steinberg & Freeley 8 \*Austin J. Freeley is a Boston based attorney who focuses on criminal, personal injury and civil rights law, AND \*\*David L. Steinberg , Lecturer of Communication Studies @ U Miami, **Argumentation and** Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making pp 45-

**Debate is a means of settling differences, so there must be a** difference of opinion or a **conflict of interest before there can be a debate. If everyone is in agreement** on a tact or value or policy, **there is no need for debate:** the matter can be settled by unanimous consent. Thus, for example, **it would be pointless to attempt to debate "Resolved: That two plus two equals four,"** because there is simply no controversy about this statement. (**Controversy is an essential prerequisite** of debate. **Where there is no clash of ideas, proposals, interests, or expressed positions on issues, there is no debate. In addition, debate cannot produce effective decisions without clear identification of a question or questions to be answered.** For example**, general argument may occur about the broad topic of illegal immigration. How many** illegal immigrants **are in the United States?** What is the impact of illegal immigration and immigrants on our economy? What is their impact on our communities? Do they commit crimes? **Do they take jobs** from American workers? Do they pay taxes? Do they require social services? Is it a problem that some do not speak English? **Is it the responsibility of employers to discourage illegal immigration** by not hiring undocumented workers? Should they have the opportunity- to gain citizenship? Docs illegal immigration pose a security threat to our country? **Do illegal immigrants do work that American workers are unwilling to do?** Are their rights as workers and as human beings at risk due to their status? Are they abused by employers, law enforcement, housing, and businesses? I low are their families impacted by their status? What is the moral and philosophical obligation of a nation state to maintain its borders? **Should we build a wall on the Mexican border**, establish a national identification can!, or enforce existing laws against employers? Should we invite immigrants to become U.S. citizens? **Surely you can think of many more concerns to be addressed by a conversation about the topic area of illegal immigration. Participation in this "debate" is likely to be emotional and intense. However, it is not likely to be productive or useful without focus on a particular question and identification of a line demarcating sides in the controversy.** To be discussed and resolved effectively, **controversies must be stated clearly. Vague understanding results in unfocused deliberation and poor decisions,** frustration, and emotional distress, as **evidenced by the failure of the United States Congress to make progress on the immigration debate** during the summer of 2007. **Someone disturbed by the problem of the growing underclass of poorly educated, socially disenfranchised youths might observe, "Public schools are doing a terrible job!** They are overcrowded, and many teachers are poorly qualified in their subject areas. Even the best teachers can do little more than struggle to maintain order in their classrooms." That same concerned citizen, facing a complex range of issues, might arrive at an unhelpful decision, such as "We ought to do something about this" or. worse. "It's too complicated a problem to deal with." **Groups of concerned citizens worried about the state of public education could join together to express their frustrations**, anger, disillusionment, and emotions regarding the schools, **but without a focus for their discussions, they could easily agree about the sorry state of education without finding points of clarity or potential solutions. A gripe session would follow. But if a precise question is posed**—such as "What can be done to improve public education?"—**then a more profitable area of discussion is opened up simply by placing a focus on the search for a concrete solution step**. **One or more judgments can be phrased in the form of debate propositions, motions for parliamentary debate, or bills for legislative assemblies.** The statements "Resolved: That the federal government should implement a program of charter schools in at-risk communities" and "Resolved: That the state of Florida should adopt a school voucher program" more clearly identify specific ways of dealing with educational problems in a manageable form, suitable for debate. **They provide specific policies to be investigated and aid discussants in identifying points of difference. To have a productive debate, which facilitates effective decision making by** directing and **placing limits on the decision** to be made, **the basis for argument should be clearly defined. If we merely talk about "homelessness" or "abortion" or "crime'\* or "global warming" we are likely to have an interesting discussion but not to establish profitable basis for argument**. For example, **the statement "Resolved: That the pen is mightier than the sword" is debatable, yet fails to provide much basis for clear argumentation**. If we take this statement to mean that the written word is more effective than physical force for some purposes, we can identify a problem area: the comparative effectiveness of writing or physical force for a specific purpose. **Although we now have a general subject, we have not yet stated a problem. It is still too broad,** too loosely worded to promote well-organized argument. **What sort of writing are we concerned with**—poems, novels, government documents, website development, advertising, or what? **What does "effectiveness" mean** in this context? What kind of physical force is being compared—fists, dueling swords, bazookas, nuclear weapons, or what? A more specific question might be. "Would a mutual defense treaty or a visit by our fleet be more effective in assuring Liurania of our support in a certain crisis?" **The basis for argument could be phrased in a debate proposition** such as "Resolved: That the United States should enter into a mutual defense treatv with Laurania." Negative advocates might oppose this proposition by arguing that fleet maneuvers would be a better solution. **This is not to say that debates should completely avoid creative interpretation** of the controversy by advocates, **or that good debates cannot occur over competing interpretations of the controversy; in fact, these sorts of debates may be very engaging. The point is that debate is best facilitated by the guidance provided by focus on a particular point of difference, which will be outlined in the following discussion.**

**B. Creativity—thinking “inside the box” forces teams to be creative about their positions and come up with innovative solutions. Absent constraints, debate becomes boring and stale—we link turn all of their offense.**

Intrator 10 (Intrator, David, President of The Creative Organization and musical composer, October 22, 2010, “Thinking Inside The Box: A Professional Creative Dispels A Popular Myth”, Training, http://www.trainingmag.com/article/thinking-inside-box) FS

**One of the most pernicious myths about creativity, one that seriously inhibits creative thinking and innovation, is the belief that one needs to “think outside the box.”** As someone who has worked for decades as a professional creative, **nothing could be further from the truth. This** a **is** view **shared by the vast majority of creatives, expressed** famously **by** the **modernist designer Charles Eames when he wrote, “Design depends largely upon constraints.” The myth of thinking outside the box stems from a fundamental misconception of what creativity is**, and what it’s not. In the popular imagination, creativity is **something weird and wacky.** The creative process is magical, or divinely inspired. But, in fact, **creativity is** not about divine inspiration or magic. It’s **about problem-solving, and by definition a problem is a constraint**, a limit, a box. One of the best illustrations of this is the work of **photographers**. They **create by excluding the great mass what’s before them**, choosing a small frame in which to work. **Within that tiny frame**, literally a box, **they uncover relationships and establish priorities**. **What makes creative problem-solving uniquely challenging is that you, as the creator, are the one defining the problem.** You’re the one choosing the frame. And **you alone determine what’s an effective solution**. **This can be quite demanding,** both intellectually and emotionally. **Intellectually, you are required to establish limits, set priorities**, and cull patterns and relationships from a great deal of material, much of it fragmentary. More often than not, this is the material you generated during brainstorming sessions. At the end of these sessions, you’re usually left with a big mess of ideas, half-ideas, vague notions, and the like. Now, chances are you’ve had a great time making your mess. You might have gone off-site, enjoyed a “brainstorming camp,” played a number of warm-up games. You feel artistic and empowered. **But to be truly creative, you have to clean up your mess, organizing those fragments into something real, something useful**, something **that actually works**. That’s the hard part. It takes a lot of energy, time, and willpower to make sense of the mess you’ve just generated. It also can be emotionally difficult. **You’ll need to throw out many ideas you originally thought were great, ideas you’ve become attached to, because they simply don’t fit into the rules you’re creating as you build your box.** You can always change the rules, but that also comes with an emotional price. Unlike many other kinds of problems, with creative problems there is no external authority to which you can appeal to determine whether you’re on the right track, whether one set of rules should have priority over another, or whether one box is better than another. There is no correct answer. Better said: There might be a number of correct answers. Or none at all. The responsibility of deciding the right path to take is entirely upon you. That’s a lot of responsibility, and it can be paralyzing. So it’s no wonder that the creative process often stalls after the brainstorming in many organizations. Whereas generating ideas is open-ended, and, in a sense, infinitely hopeful, having to pare those ideas down is restrictive, tedious, and, at times, scary. The good news, however, is that understanding the creative process as problem-solving is ultimately liberating. For one, all of **those** left-brainers **with well-honed rational skills will find themselves far more creative than they ever thought**. They’ll discover their talents for organization, abstraction, and clarity are very much what’s required to be a true creative thinker. **Viewing creativity as problem-solving also makes the whole process far less intimidating**, even though it might lose some of its glamour and mystery. Moreover, **since creative problems are open to rational analysis, they can be broken down into smaller components that are easier to address.** Best of all, **the very act of problem-solving, of organizing and trying making sense of things, helps generate new ideas.** Paradoxically, **thinking within a box may be one of the most effective brainstorming techniques there** is. That may be what Charles Eames meant when he added, “I welcome constraints.” Without some sort of structure to your creative thinking, you’re just flailing about. For a while you might feel like you’re making progress, generating a great mess of ideas that might hold some potential. But **to turn** those **ideas into something truly innovative, your best bet is to** build your box and **play by the rules** of your own creation.

**C. Livability—limits are key to prevent the debate workload from spiraling out of control. We need time to do things like spend time with our families and shower—it would be impossible to do those things and also cut substantive strategies against the field if everyone read a non-topical aff.**

**2. Switch-Side Debate—their interpretation allows teams to only debate one side of an issue. Switch-side debate is good:**

**A. Critical thinking—switching sides forces debaters to assess all possible outcomes of a policy and sharpens their analysis of complex situations**

Harrigan 8NDT champion, debate coach at UGA (Casey, thesis submitted to Wake Forest Graduate Faculty for Master of Arts in Communication, “A defense of switch side debate”, http://dspace.zsr.wfu.edu/jspui/bitstream/10339/207/1/harrigancd052008, p. 57-59)

**Along these lines, the greatest benefit of switching sides**, which goes to the heart of contemporary debate, **is its inducement of critical thinking.** Defined as “reasonable reflective thinking that is focused on deciding what to believe or do” (Ennis, 1987, p. 10), **critical thinking learned through debate teaches students not just how advocate and argue, but how to decide as well**. **Each and every student,** whether in debate or (more likely) at some later point in life, **will be placed in the position of the decision-maker**. Faced with competing options whose costs and benefits are initially unclear, **critical thinking is necessary to assess all the possible outcomes of each choice,** c**ompare their relative merits, and arrive at some final decision about which is preferable**. In some instances, such as choosing whether to eat Chinese or Indian food for dinner, the importance of making the correct decision is minor. For many other decisions, however, **the implications of choosing an imprudent course of action are potentially grave.** As Robert Crawford notes, **there are “issues of unsurpassed importance in the daily lives of millions upon millions of people…being decided to a considerable extent by the power of public speaking**” (2003). Although the days of the Cold War are over, and the risk that “the next Pearl Harbor could be ‘compounded by hydrogen’” (Ehninger and Brockriede, 1978, p. 3) is greatly reduced, the manipulation of public support before the invasion of Iraq in 2003 points to the continuing necessity of training a well-informed and critically-aware public (Zarefsky, 2007).**In the absence of debate-trained critical thinking, ignorant but ambitious politicians and persuasive but nefarious leaders would be much more likely to draw the country, and possibly the world, into conflicts with incalculable losses in terms of human well-being. Given the myriad threats of global proportions that will require incisive solutions, including global warming, the spread of pandemic diseases, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, cultivating a robust and effective society of critical decision-makers is essential. A**s Louis Rene Beres writes, “with such learning, we Americans could prepare…not as immobilized objects of false contentment, but as authentic citizens of an endangered planet” (2003). Thus, **it is not surprising that** critical thinking has been called “the highest educational goal of the activity” (Parcher, 1998). W**hile arguing from conviction can foster limited critical thinking skills, the element of switching sides is necessary to sharpen debate’s critical edge and ensure that decisions are made in a reasoned manner instead of being driven by ideology**. Debaters trained in SSD are more likely to evaluate both sides of an argument before arriving at a conclusion and are less likely to dismiss potential arguments based on his or her prior beliefs (Muir 1993). **In addition, debating both sides teaches “conceptual flexibility,” where decision-makers are more likely to reflect upon the beliefs that are held before coming to a final opinion** (Muir, 1993, p. 290). **Exposed to many arguments on each side of an issue, debaters learn that public policy is characterized by extraordinary complexity that requires careful consideration before action.** Finally**, these arguments are confirmed by the preponderance of empirical research demonstrating a link between competitive SSD and critical thinking** (Allen, Berkowitz)

**B. Tolerance—switching sides makes debaters more tolerant of arguments and ideas that are the opposite of their own—their one-sided approach promotes dogmatism**

Muir 93 (Star, Professor of Communication – George Mason U., “A Defense of the Ethics of Contemporary Debate”, **Philosophy & Rhetoric**, Vol. 26, No. 4, p. 288-289)

The role of **switch-side debate is especially important in the** oral **defense of arguments that foster tolerance** without accruing the moral complications of acting on such beliefs. **The forum is** therefore **unique in providing debaters with** attitudes of **tolerance** without committing them to active moral irresponsibility. As Freeley notes, **debaters are** indeed **exposed to a multivalued world**, both within and between the sides of a given topic. Yet this exposure hardly commits them to such "mistaken" values. In this view, **the divorce of the game from the "real world" can be** seen as **a means of gaining perspective** without obligating students to validate their hypothetical value structure through immoral actions.'s Values clarification, Stewart is correct in pointing out, does not mean that no values are developed. Two very important values— **tolerance and fairness—inhere to a significant degree in the ethics of switch-side debate**. A second point about the charge of relativism is that tolerance is related to the development of reasoned moral viewpoints. **The willingness to recognize** the existence of **other views, and to grant alternative positions** a degree of **credibility, is** a value **fostered by switch-side debate**: Alternately **debating both sides** of the same question . . . **inculcates a deep-seated** attitude of **tolerance** toward differing points of view. **To** be forced to **debate only one side leads to an ego-identification with that side**. , . . The other side in contrast is seen only as something to be discredited. Arguing as persuasively as one can for completely opposing views is one way of giving recognition to the idea that a strong case can generally be made for the views of earnest and intelligent men, however such views may clash with one's own. . . .**Promoting** this kind of **tolerance is** perhaps **one of the greatest benefits debating both sides has to offer**. 5' The activity should encourage debating both sides of a topic, reasons Thompson, because **debaters are "more likely to realize that propositions are bilateral. It is those who fail to recognize this** fact who **become intolerant, dogmatic, and bigoted**.""\* While Theodore Roosevelt can hardly be said to be advocating bigotry, his efforts to turn out advocates convinced of their rightness is not a position imbued with tolerance.

**C. Activism—only switching sides teaches students to anticipate counter-arguments and build coalitions effectively, which is necessary for sustained activism**

Harrigan 8 - Casey Harrigan, Associate Director of Debate at UGA, Master’s in Communications, Wake Forest U., 2008, “A Defense of Switch Side Debate”, Master’s thesis at Wake Forest, Department of Communication, May, pp.49-50

Third, there is an important question of means. Even the best activist intentions have little practical utility as long as they remain purely cordoned off in the realm of theoretical abstractions. **Creating programs of action that seek to produce material changes in the quality of life for** suffering **people**, **not mere wishful thinking** in the ivory towers of academia, **should be the goal of any revolutionary project**. Frequently, for strategies for change, the devil lies in the details. It is not possible to simply click one’s ruby red slippers together and wish for alternatives to come into being. Lacking a plausible mechanism to enact reforms, many have criticized critical theory as being a “fatally flawed enterprise” (Jones 1999). For activists, **learning the skills to successfully negotiate hazardous political terrain is crucial**. They must know when to and when not to compromise, negotiate, and strike political alliances in order to be successful. The pure number of failed movements in the past several decades demonstrates the severity of the risk assumed by groups who do not focus on refining their preferred means of change. Given the importance of strategies for change, SSD is even more crucial. Debaters trained by debating both sides are substantially more likely to be effective advocates than those experienced only in arguing on behalf of their own convictions. For several reasons, **SSD instills** a series of **practices that are essential for a successful activist agenda**. First, **SSD creates** more **knowledgeable advocates for public policy issues**. As part of the process of learning to argue both sides, debaters are forced to understand the intricacies of multiple sides of the argument considered. Debaters must not only know how to research and speak on behalf of their own personal convictions, but also for the opposite side in order to defend against attacks of that position. Thus, **when placed in the position of being required to** publicly **defend an argument**, **students trained via SSD are more likely to be able to** present and **persuasively defend their positions**. Second, **learning the nuances of all sides of a position** greatly **strengthens the** resulting **convictions of debaters**, **their ability to anticipate opposing arguments**, **and the effectiveness of their attempts to locate the crux**, nexus and loci **of arguments**. As is noted earlier, conviction is a result, not a prerequisite of debate. **Switching sides** and experimenting with possible arguments for and against controversial issues, **in the end**, **makes students more likely to ground their beliefs in a reasoned form of critical thinking that is durable and unsusceptible to knee-jerk criticisms**. As a result, even though it may appear to be inconsistent with advocacy, **SSD “actually created stronger advocates” that are more likely to be successful in achieving their goals** (Dybvig and Iverson 2000). Proponents of abandoning SSD and returning to debating from conviction should take note. Undoubtedly, many of their ideas would be beneficial if enacted and deserve the support of activist energies. However, anti-SSD critics seem to have given little thought to the important question of how to translate good ideas into practice. By **teaching students to privilege** their own **personal beliefs prior to a thorough engagement with all sides of an issue**, **debating from conviction produces activists that are more likely to be politically impotent**. By **positing that debaters should bring prior beliefs to the table** in a rigid manner **and assuming** that **compromising is tantamount to** giving in to **cooptation**, **the case of debating from conviction undercuts the tactics necessary for forging effective coalitional politics**. **Without such broad-based alliances, sustainable political changes will** likely **be impossible** (Best & Kellner 2001).

**3. Topic Education—their interpretation diverts focus away from the topic. Topic education is good:**

**A. Policy relevance—learning about how theory relates to policy and discussing implementation is crucial to influence real policymakers—without tying advocacy to policy, debate becomes irrelevant**

Nye 09 - Joseph Nye, professor at Harvard University and former dean of the Harvard Kennedy School, 4-13-2009, Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/04/12/AR2009041202260\_pf.html 4-13-09

President Obama has appointed some distinguished academic economists and lawyers to his administration, but few high-ranking political scientists have been named. In fact, the editors of a recent poll of more than 2,700 international relations experts declared that "the walls surrounding the ivory tower have never seemed so high." While important American scholars such as Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski took high-level foreign policy positions in the past, that path has tended to be a one-way street. **Not many top-ranked scholars** of international relations **are going into government**, and even fewer return to contribute to academic theory. The 2008 Teaching, Research and International Policy (TRIP) poll, by the Institute for Theory and Practice in International Relations, showed that of the 25 scholars rated as producing the most interesting scholarship during the past five years, only three had ever held policy positions (two in the U.S. government and one in the United Nations). The fault for this growing gap lies not with the government but with the academics. Scholars are paying less attention to questions about how their work relates to the policy **world**, and in many departments a focus on policy can hurt one's career. Advancement comes faster for those who develop mathematical models, new methodologies or theories expressed in jargon that is unintelligible to policymakers. A survey of articles published over the lifetime of the American Political Science Review found that about one in five dealt with policy prescription or criticism in the first half of the century, while only a handful did so after 1967. Editor Lee Sigelman observed in the journal's centennial issue that "if 'speaking truth to power' and contributing directly to public dialogue about the merits and demerits of various courses of action were still numbered among the functions of the profession, one would not have known it from leafing through its leading journal." As citizens, **academics might be considered to have an obligation to help improve on policy ideas when they can**. Moreover, **such engagement can enhance** and enrich **academic work, and** thus **the ability of academics to teach the next generation**. As former undersecretary of state David Newsom argued a decade ago, "**the** growing **withdrawal of** university **scholars behind curtains of theory** and modeling **would** not have wider significance if this trend did not **raise questions regarding the preparation of new generations and the future influence of the academic community on public and official perceptions of international issues** and events. Teachers plant seeds that shape the thinking of each new generation; this is probably the academic world's most lasting contribution." Yet too often scholars teach theory and methods that are relevant to other academics but not to the majority of the students sitting in the classroom before them. **Some** academics **say that while the** growing **gap between theory and policy may have costs for policy**, **it** has **produced better social science theory**, and that **this is more important than whether such scholarship is relevant**. Also, to some extent, the gap is an inevitable result of the growth and specialization of knowledge. Few people can keep up with their subfields, much less all of social science. But **the danger is** that **academic theorizing will say more and more about less and less**. Even when **academics** supplement their usual trickle-down approach to policy by writing in journals, newspapers or blogs, or by consulting for candidates or public officials, they **face** many **competitors for attention**. More than 1,200 **think tanks** in the United States **provide not only ideas but also experts ready to comment** or consult **at a moment's notice**. Some of these new transmission belts serve as translators and additional outlets for academic ideas, but **many add a bias** provided by their founders and funders. As a group, think tanks are heterogeneous in scope, funding, ideology and location, but **universities generally offer a more neutral viewpoint.** While pluralism of institutional pathways is good for democracy, **the policy process is diminished by the withdrawal of the academic community**. **The solutions must come via a reappraisal within the academy itself**. Departments should give greater weight to real-world relevance and impact in hiring and promoting young scholars. Journals could place greater weight on relevance in evaluating submissions. Studies of specific regions deserve more attention. Universities could facilitate interest in the world by giving junior faculty members greater incentives to participate in it. That should include greater toleration of unpopular policy positions. One could multiply such useful suggestions, but young people should not hold their breath waiting for them to be implemented. If anything, the trends in academic life seem to be headed in the opposite direction.

### 1NC

**Identity politics is a divide-and-rule strategy and perpetuates localism destroying the political universalism of class,**

**Hennessy** (Prof @ SUNY Albany) **2K**

[Rosemary, Profit and Pleasure: Sexual Identities in Late Capitalism, Routledge]

Basic to the structure of late capitalism is a new global division of labor. Of course, capitalism has relied on an international division of labor since its inception, and so strictly speaking it has always been global. The industrial take-off in early-nineteenth-century Europe was possible because of the accumulation of wealth accrued from colonies all over the globe, and the development of monopoly capitalism in Europe and the United States depended on finding sources of raw materials and expanding markets in far-flung colonial territories. What distinguishes late capitalism’s global division of labor is the way new technologies have accelerated the speed and dispersed the space of production to unprecedented levels. Although late capitalism has magnified the homogenization of social relations and cultural forms, it is also characterized by unprecedented fragmentation of the production process into subnational localities. Since the end of World War II, and to an intensified degree **since the 1970s, production has become increasingly flexible** as capital seeks out those spaces for production that offer the cheapest labor source and the least political interference. This has meant that production is no longer centered entirely in a single site, and it no longer takes place primarily on the assembly line. Instead, production relies on heightened mobility, and on time and space compression— making use of profit-enhancing strategies like small batch, just-intime production, and outsourcing, with the manufacture and assembly of component parts sometimes spread over continents or diffused into “private” homework. L**ate capitalism is also more intensely transnational in the sense that a network of industrial and service formations rather than a single nation serves as its center**, and the transnational corporation is now the prime determiner of capital transmission. These changes in production have challenged and recast the post– World War II division of geopolitics into first, second, and third worlds. The “second world” of the Soviet bloc has virtually disappeared; parts of the “undeveloped third world” are full and competitive participants in transnational capital exchange and are saturated with first-world corporations and commodities, while parts of the “first world” harbor relations of production and ways of life that are indistinguishable from conditions in many third-world countries. **Flexible production has made organized resistance by labor more difficult** and the terms for those who do not participate efficiently in late capitalist production more arrogant and absolute: **nonplayers are simply moved out of capital’s pathways** (Dirlik 32). Culturally **this interplay between global homogenization and subnational fragmentation has registered in new forms of consciousness and transnational identity— multiculturalism for one, and more gender-flexible sexual identities for another— that coexist with or are being articulated into the prevailing values and norms of Europe and the United States** (Dirlik 28– 31). Late capitalism’s new economic, political, and cultural structures have also intensified the relationship between global and local situations. Global transnational corporations rely on localities of many sorts as sites for capital accumulation through production, marketing, and knowledgemaking. **Global-localism has become both the paradigm of production and an explicit new strategy by which the corporation infiltrates various localities without forfeiting its global aims** (Dirlik 34). From corporate headquarters, CEOs orchestrate the incorporation of particular localities into the demands of global capital at the same time that the corporation is domesticated into the local society. **Thus it is in the interests of global capitalism to celebrate and enhance awareness of local communities, cultures, and forms of identification. But this cannot be done in a way that makes evident their exploitation, that is, in a way that makes visible the real material relationship between the global and the local** (Dirlik 35). **Against capitalism’s penetration of local communities, many “local” groups**— indigenous people’s movements, ethnic and women’s organizations, lesbian, gay, and transgender rights movements— **have presented themselves as potential sites for liberation struggles. Undoubtedly, these struggles have indeed accomplished changes** that have enhanced the quality of life for countless people. **But the celebration of “the local” as a self-defined space for the affirmation of cultural identity and the formation of political resistance often also play into late capitalism’s opportunistic use of local-izing— not just as an arrangement of production but also as a structure of knowing. The turn to “the local” has also been the characteristic talisman of a postmodern culture and politics that has repudiated the totalizing narratives of modernity. The claims of indigenous and ethnic groups, of women, and of lesbian and gay people have been an important part of postmodern challenges to the adequacy of cultural narratives**— among them enlightened humanism and Eurocentric scholarship— that do not address the histories of subaltern peoples. **However, insofar as their counter-narratives put forward an alternative that de-links the interests of particular social groups from the larger collective that they are part of, they tend to promote political projects that keep the structures of capitalism invisible**.

**The affs focus on ineluctable difference is inaccurate and collapses a Marxist approach to politics.**

E. **San Juan 2**, Jr. Crystal Bartolovich and - editor, Neil Lazarus 2 - editor. Marxism, Modernity and Postcolonial Studies. Contributors: Publisher: Cambridge University Press. Place of Publication: Cambridge, England. Publication Year: 2002.

Questia p. 221-239

I have dwelt at length on this topic because of postcolonial critics' insistence that the method of historical materialism is fatally compromised by its Enlightenment provenance. If Marx is a Eurocentric apologist for the “civilizing mission” of imperialism, then we should have nothing to do with his indictment of capitalism and advocacy of socialist revolution. It might be instructive to note that **the charge of Eurocentrism leveled against Marx does not permit a nuanced and rigorous appraisal of his critique of bourgeois thought and practice, or distinguish the nature of capitalist modernity as a specific epochal form, one which is constituted by the complex, uneven relation between colonizer and colonized**. **Capitalism disappears when all of modernity, both positive and negative elements, become ascribed to a geopolitical region** (the metropole vis-à-vis the periphery) **that cannot be divorced from the world-system of which it is an integral part.**  Samir Amin has perspicaciously described the historical genealogy of Eurocentrism in the drive of capital to subordinate everything to exchange value. But this drive to uniformity also precipitates its opposite, unequal accumulation or impoverishment of the masses. For Amin, the most explosive contradiction generated by transnational capital inheres in the center/periphery polarization and its corollary, the “imperialist dimension of capitalist expansion” (1989: 141). **Postcolonial affirmation of cultural difference, or the interstitial and syncretic byproducts of the center/periphery dynamic, evades a critique of bourgeois economism and reproduces itself as an inverted Eurocentrism that cannot resolve the crisis of inequality**. **A genuine universalism cannot emerge from incommensurable and provincialized cultures, no matter how valorized as singular or cosmopolitan; the impasse can be broken only by a national popular-democratic breakthrough instanced by national liberation struggles.**  II It is not exorbitant to state that today all social relations and practices, as well as the process of social transformation, labor under the imperatives of accumulation, competition, commodification, and profitmaximization. **Postcolonial paradigms of hybridity and ambivalence are unable to offer frames of intelligibility that can analyze and critique the internal contradictions embedded in the neoliberal reality and ideology of the “free market.” Driven by a pragmatic empiricism, postcolonialism cannot offer a frame of intelligibility for a “cognitive mapping” of all those historical trends that marked the breakdown of developmentalism, modernization theory, and other theoretical solutions to the crisis of monopoly capital since the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 up to the scrapping of the Bretton Woods agreement and a unitary monetary system**. As many have noted, **the logic and rhetoric of postcolonialism coincide suspiciously with the anarchic “free market” and the vicissitudes of finance capital on a global scale**. Bound by its problematic, the postcolonial critic cannot even entertain the crucial question that Amin poses: “how can we develop the productive forces without letting commodity relations gain ground?” (1977: 101). -229- There have been many explanations for this inadequacy and limitation. Amin (1998) locates it in postcolonialism's rejection of Enlightenment narratives of emancipation and convivial democracy. **The excesses of instrumental reason are ascribed to the teleology of progress instead of the logic of capitalism and its presuppositions (private property, entrepreneurship, wage labor, technological improvement, laws of the market). The conflation of the ideals of enlightenment with the telos of utilitarian capitalism and its encapsulation in the historiographic fortunes of modernity has led to a skeptical, nominalist conception of subjectivity and agency. Disavowing modernity and the principle of collective human agency–humans make their own history under determinate historical conditions–postcolonialism submits to the neoliberal bourgeois cosmos of fragmentation, individualist warfare, free-playing decentered monads, and a regime of indeterminacy and contingency. This ironic turn damages postcolonialism's claim to liberate humans from determinisms and essentialisms of all kinds.**  I think **the fundamental error may be traced to two sources.** We have, **first, the inability to conceptualize mediation or connections in a dialectical manner, substituting instead a seriality of differences whose equivalence or solidarity remains unpredictable;** and **second**, entailed by the first premise, **the incapacity to conceive of the conjunctural moment of society as inscribed in the uneven development of the world-system. Uneven development involves the inescapable polarization of the world into peripheral and central economies, tied with the intrinsic contradiction between labor and capital and the international division of labor whose boundaries were laid by the history of European colonialism and later by finance or monopoly capital.** Uneven development implies a polyrhythmic configuration of history characterized by the Unglei chmassigkeit der Zeit (to use Ernst Bloch's category [1973]). Why theorize mediation and uneven development in a precise historicized fashion? Because our intent is to “master” and so escape the “nightmare of history and to win a measure of control over the supposedly blind and natural 'laws' of socioeconomic fatality.” As Fredric Jameson suggests, **historical reconstruction, “the positing of global characterizations and hypotheses, the abstraction from the 'blooming, buzzing' confusion of immediacy, was always a radical intervention in the here-and-now and the promise of resistance to its blind fatalities**” (1998: 35). From a historical-materialist perspective, **the dynamic process of social reality cannot be grasped without comprehending the connections and the concrete in ternal relations that constitute the totality of its objective determinations**. Several levels of abstraction have to be clarified among which is the relation between the knowing subject and the surrounding world (both nature and the built environment). Truth in this tradition comes from human practice, the intermediary between consciousness and its object; and **it is human labor** (knowing and making as a theorized synthesis) **that unites theory and practice.** As Lenin puts it, **everything is mediated and connected by transitions that unite opposites,** “transitions of every determination, quality, feature, side, property, into every other” so that “the individual exists only in the connection that leads to the universal” (1963: 132). The reciprocal interaction of various levels of formal abstractions has been elaborated by Bertell Ollman (1993) under the categories of “metamorphosis” and contradictions. These levels of abstract mediation, however, need to be transcoded into their concrete manifestation without necessarily succumbing to the one-sided immediacy of empiricism or pragmatism. Otherwise, what Fabian (1983) calls the allochronic orientation of Eurocentric thought with its taxonomic, noncoeval representation of Others would continue to prevail. **What is required next is to confront the second-order mediations which are historically specific and transcendable**, namely, the market, money, private property, the transformation and subordination of use-value to exchange value–in short, **the sources of alienation and perversion of** what Meszaros calls “**productive self-mediation” of individuals in social life. Alienation on the level of national struggle can only be resolved in the colonized people's conquest of full sovereignty, “the socialization of the principal means of production”** (Meszaros 1983: 13) **and reproduction in a socialist transformation.** Indeed, **it is these historical phenomena of alienation and reification that poststructuralist thought hypostatizes into the nihilism of modernity, converting mediation (transition) into serial negation and occluding its prefigurative, transformative phase or aspect** (Lukács 2000). Contradiction, sublation, and overdetermination do not figure as meaningful concepts in postcolonial theorizing. Without a concept of totality, however, the notion of mediation remains vacuous and useless. All determination is mediation, Roy Bhaskar reminds us in his magisterial study Dialectic (1993). Totality in its historical concreteness becomes accessible to us in the concept of uneven development, and its corollary ideas of overdetermination (or, in Amin's thought, “under deter mination”), combined development in the coexistence of various modes of production in a specific social for mation, or in an ot her frame work, Wallerste in's world-system mapping of periphery and core societies**. We have come to accept as a commonplace the differential rhythm of development of societies, the uneven pace due to presence or absence of cumulative growth in the use of production techniques, labor organization, and so on, as reflected in Marx's inquiry into Russia and Asia mentioned earlier.**  **Uneven development results from the peculiar combination of many factors which have marked societies as peripheral or central** (Löwy 1981; Novack 1966). In many societies shaped by colonial conquest and imperial domination, uneven and combined development is discernible in the co-presence of a modern sector (usually foreign dominated or managed by the state) and a traditional sector characterized by precapitalist modes of production and ruled by merchant capitalist and feudal/tributary ruling classes. **In** these **peripheral formations, we find a lack of cumulative growth, backward agriculture limited by the lack of an internal market, with the accumulated money capital diverted from whatever industrial enterprises there are into speculative activities in real estate, usury, and hoarding** (Mandel 1983). This unsynchronized and asymmetrical formation, with variations throughout the postcolonial world, serves as the ideal habitat for “magic realism” and wild absurdist fantasies (Borges, Cortázar), as well as all those cultural expressions and practices described as hybrid, creolized, syncretic, ambivalent, multiplicitous, and so on, which postcolonial theory has fetishized and reified as permanent, ever-recurring, and ineluctable qualities (San Juan 1998). In my view, **this historical conjuncture of uneven and combined development can only be grasped by dialectical assessments of imperialism like those propounded by** Gramsci, C. L. R. James, Walter Rodney, Amilcar Cabral, and others in **the Marxist–Leninist tradition**. It was Lenin who remedied the classical limitation of the Second International and the social democratic parties by integrating into his idea of world revolution the revolt of the industrial working class in Europe with the mass uprisings of small colonized nations, as well as peasant revolts against landowners. His post-1914 writings theorized how the “particular” of national liberation movements can, under certain conditions, become the road to the universal of socialism. In this discourse, mediation assumes the form of historically specific contradictions between oppressed peoples in the colonies and oppressor nations. As Kevin Anderson argues, “Lenin's theory of imperialism has become dialectical in the sense of pointing not only to the economic side of imperialism but also to a new revolutionary subject arising from within global imperialism: national liberation movements” (1995: 142). **Unless we can improve on** Lenin's theory of national liberation with its processual or **dialectical materialist method, we will only be indulging in postcolonial verbal magic and vertiginous tropology that seems to be infinitely reproduced by a delirious “otherness machine**” (Appiah 1991: 356). III As for the concrete translation of the Leninist tradition into situated historical praxis, I can only allude to the brilliant and enduring example of Amilcar Cabral. In what way does Cabral supersede the mechanical version of decolonization as a valorization of interstitiality, syncretism, and transculturation? A few key features of Cabral's thought need to be underscored. His theory of national revolution is a creative application of Marxism as a dialectical theory of action in which history generates the unforeseen within the parameters of what objectively exists. Cabral understood the Marxist insight that “the process of history seeks itself and proves itself in praxis” (Lefebvre 1969: 162). He theorized national liberation in his concrete milieu (the Portuguese colonies of Guinea Bissau and Cape Verde islands) through the paradigm of interacting modes of production in history. He insisted on the centrality of the level of productive forces as the “true and permanent driving power of history” (Cabral 1973: 42). Imperialist rule deprived the colonized peoples of agency, the vocation of shaping their own history. Since imperialist domination negated “the historical development of the dominated people” (42–43) by means of violently usurping the free operation of the process of development of the productive forces, the goal of decolonization is “the liberation of the process of development of national productive forces” (43). The struggle for national liberation is not simply a cultural fact, but also a cultural factor generating new forms and content in the process (Cabral 1979: 211). For Cabral, culture is the salient or key constituent of the productive forces. Culture becomes the decisive element in grasping the dialectic of subjective and objective forces, the level of productive forces and the production relations, as well as the uneven terrain of class struggles: “Culture is simultaneously the fruit of a people's history and a -233- determinant of history, by the positive or negative influence which it exerts on the evolution of relationships between man and his environment, among men or groups of men within a society, as well as among different societies” (1979: 41). But Cabral urges a concrete differentiation of tendencies and possibilities: “Nor must we forget that culture, both as a cause and an effect of history, includes essential and secondary elements, strengths and weaknesses, merits and defects, positive and negative aspects, factors both for progress and stagnation or regression, contradictions, conflicts… Culture develops unevenly at the level of a continent, a 'race,' even a community” (210, 212). If liberation is an act of culture, it is also a struggle to shape a richer culture that is simultaneously “popular, national, scientific and universal” (212). Framed within the problematic of a non-linear narrative, Cabral conceives of national liberation as a wide-ranging transformation of the combined political, economic, and cultural institutions and practices of the colonized society. It is not narrowly culturalist or merely superstructural because culture refers to the “dynamic synthesis of the material and spiritual historical reality of a society.” In a broad sense, it is the recovery of specific African forms of subjectivity, a “regaining of the historical personality of the people, its return to history through the destruction of imperialist domination.” This recovery is staged as a popular cultural renaissance with the party as the chief pedagogical agency wielding the “weapon of theory, ” the organized political expression of a mass, national-popular culture in the making. This renaissance occurred in the praxis of the liberated zones controlled by the PAIGC (African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde) where the culture-changing processes of criticism and self-criticism, democratic discussion, teaching and learning from the participants, and so on were encouraged and institutionalized. This will recall Marx's dialectical thesis of an alternative to unilinear evolutionism of the Russian village commune: if the subjective force of the peasantry acquires consciousness and organized identity, the objective situation can be transformed in a liberatory direction (Marx 1971b). Cabral was called by his people Fundador da Nacionalidade, Founder of the Nationality, not Founder of the Nation. According to Basil Davidson, this is because “the nation was and is a collectivity and necessarily founds itself, but [Cabral was the] founder of the process whereby this collectivity could (and does) identify itself and continue to build its post-colonial culture” (1986: 39). Cabral also believed that “the dialectical nature of identity lies in the fact that it both identifies and distinguishes”(1979: 208). Seizing the strategic initiative, Cabral exhorted his comrades and fighters to engage in a double and totalizing task cognizant of the uneven cultural and ideological strata of the geopolitical terrain: every element of the population in our land in Guinea and Cape Verde, should be aware that our struggle is not only waged on the political level and on the military level. Our struggle–our resistance–must be waged on all levels of the life of our people. We must destroy everything the enemy can use to continue their domination over our people, but at the same time we must be able to construct everything that is needed to create a new life in our land.(qtd. in Cohen 1998: 44). Cabral combined national and social elements into an insurrectionary movement in which the partisan unit, no longer a local entity but a “body of permanent and mobile cadres around whom the local force is formed” (Hobsbawm 1973: 166), became the germ of the “new life, ” the embryonic nationality becoming the nation. Developing certain themes in Fanon, Cabral's Marxism is unique in concentrating on the potential nation as “a form of revolutionary collective subjectivity” mediating actual classes, sectors, and groups into a “nation-for-itself” that can reclaim the “inalienable right of every people to have their own history” based on their right to control “the process of development of national productive forces.” Cabral located the roots of this subjectivity in the cultural resistance of the masses which was “protracted and multiple, ” “only possible because by preserving their culture and their identity the masses retain consciousness of their individual and collective dignity despite the vexations, humiliations and cruelties they are exposed to” (1979: 209). As Timothy Luke acutely remarks, Cabral valued the “emancipatory forms of collective subjectivity” in the colonized subjects and so promoted “the politically organized and scientifically rationalized reconstitution of the traditional African peoples' history-making and culture-building capacities” (1990: 191). Cabral urged his activists: “I am asking you to accomplish things on your own initiative because everybody must participate in the struggle” (qtd. in Chaliand 1969: 68). Cabral's originality thus lies in his recognizing that the nation-in-itself immanent in the daily lives of African peoples can be transformed into a nation-for-itself, this latter concept denoting the peoples' exercise of their historical right of self-determination through the mediation of the national liberation movement, with the PAIGC as an educational organizing force that seeks to articulate the nationalpopular will. Contrary to postcolonial speculation, Cabral's project is the making of a nation in the course of the anti-imperialist struggle. Comprised of numerous ethnic groups living apart, highly fragmented with over a dozen languages, Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde did not fulfill the orthodox qualifications of a nation laid down by Stalin: “a stable community of people formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up manifested in the common culture” (Stalin 1970: 68). Cabral's exceptional contribution consists in articulating the nation-in-process (of transition from potentiality to actuality) in the struggle against Portuguese colonialism. The project of the party he founded, the PAIGC, aimed to generate national awareness by mass mobilization of the peasants in conjunction with the petty bourgeoisie, the embryonic proletariat, and the declassed youth. Through skillful organization and painstaking ideological education, the PAIGC converted the cultural resistance of the tribal villages into a dynamic and formidable force capable of defeating a technologically sophisticated enemy. Cabral began from the paradoxical phenomenon of the indigenous petty bourgeoisie beginning to acquire a consciousness of the totality by comparison of the various parts of colonized society. He exhorted the petty bourgeoisie to commit class suicide in order to coalesce with the peasantry (the workers constituted a tiny minority; a national bourgeoisie did not exist); but Cabral had no illusions that such alliances would spontaneously firm up in a postcolonial environment. He stated before his assassination on 20 January 1973:“You know who is capable of taking control of the state apparatus after independence … The African petty bourgeoisie has to be the inheritor of state power, although I wish I could be wrong. The moment national liberation comes and the petty bourgeoisie takes power we enter, or rather return, to history and the internal contradictions break out again” (qtd. in Davidson 1969: 134). Cabral's insight warns us of the dangers of reifying postcolonial culture as an interstitial, ambiguous space of contestation devoid of any outside from which critique can be formulated. Contradictions persist even in transitory class alliances (the famous unity of opposites in Lenin's discourse), hence the need to calculate the stages of the struggle which demand strategic mutations and tactical alterations, while keeping in mind a constant theme: “the masses keep intact the sense of their individual and collective dignity” (Cabral 1973: 69). The axiom of uneven and combined development rules out postcolonial assumptions of contingent heterogeneity and incommensurable disparities of individuals that ignore mass native cultural resistance. Cabral upheld an anti-postcolonial belief in the “supremacy of social life over individual life, ” of “society as a higher form of life” (1979: 208), which in effect contradicts the neo-Kantian attribution of moral and rational agency to bourgeois individuals, a criterion that “postpositivist realists” (Mohanty 1995) and assorted deconstru ctionists espouse. Notwithstanding the resurgence of armed anti-imperialist insurgency in “third world” neocolonies like Colombia, the Philippines, Mexico (Chiapas), the moment of Cabral might be deemed irretrievably remote now from our present disputes. However, the formerly subjugated peoples of color grudgingly acknowledged by Western humanism cannot be simply pacified by reforming capitalism's international division of labor. The postcolonial cult of the Leibnizian conceit (Harvey 1996), in which alterity and marginality automatically acquire subversive entitlement, has carried out the containment of Marxist ideas and ideals of national liberation by an aestheticizing maneuver analogous to what Neil Larsen discerned in cultural studies: “a subtle transfer of emancipatory aims from the process of objective social transformation to the properly 'cultural' task of intervention in the 'subject'-forming play of discourse (s)” (1995: 201). But as long as capitalism produces uneven and polarizing trends in all social formations, there will always exist residual and emergent agencies challenging the reign of “the law of value” and postmodern barbarism (Amin 1998). We cannot of course return wholesale to the classic period of national liberation struggles indexed by the names of Nkrumah, Cabral, Ho Chi Minh, Guevara, Fanon, and others. My purpose in bringing up Cabral is simply to refute the argument that historical materialist thinking is useless in grasping the complexity of colonialism and its aftermath. Would shifting our emphasis then on studying the subaltern mind remedy the inadequacies and limitations of postcolonial theory? I might insert here the view of Jon Stratton and Ien Ang, who believe that the limits of the postcolonial/diasporic trajectory can be made up by the voices of the indigenous and the subaltern within the context of the “relativization of all discursive self/other positionings within the Anglophone cultural studies community” (1996: 386). This intervention in the site of textual-discursive representation is salutary, but the problem of articulating a counter-hegemonic strategy focusing on the “weak links” (where the IMF/World Bank's “structural conditionalities” continue to wreak havoc) remains on the agenda. For it cannot be denied that within the hybridizing, syncretic, borderless milieu of the postcolonial episteme one encounters, without much uncanny afterthought, “the still globally culturally hegemonic realm of the USA” (King 1995: 117). Finally**, I want to situate postcolonialism as a symptomatic recuperation of finance capital, at best the imaginary resolution of contradictions between exploited South and exploiting North, within the altered geopolitical alignments of the world-system** (Wallerstein 1995). **The world-wide protest against the World Trade Organization**, the **I**nternational **M**onetary **F**und, **and** the **World Bank, instanced by the popular demonstrations in Seattle**, Washington, in November 1999 **augurs the sharpening of contradictions at the heart of globalizing capital, revitalizing traditional “left” coalitions and generating new agencies of revolutionary transformation in the peripheries and within the metropolitan heartlands. The “third world” has now migrated into the centers whose “weak links” offer opportunities for a variety of interventions that seem to elude postcolonial intellects.**  The “third world” was a viable conceptualization of the nationalist bourgeois struggles that led to the independence of India, Ghana, the Philippines, Egypt, Indonesia, and other nation-states after World War II. The classic postcolonial states created the Bandung coalition of non-aligned states which gave a semblance of unity to the “third world.” However, United States hegemony during the Cold War continued until the challenge in Vietnam, Cuba, and elsewhere. The last expression of “third world” solidarity, the demand for a “New International Economic Order” staged in the United Nations, came in the wake of the oil crisis of 1973; but the OPEC nations, with their political liabilities, could not lead the “third world” of poor, dependent nations against US hegemony. Notwithstanding the debacle in Vietnam and the series of armed interventions in the Caribbean and elsewhere, US world supremacy was maintained throughout the late 1970s and 1980s by economic force. This mode of winning consent from the “third world” used monetarist policies that caused lower export earnings and high interest rates, reducing these polities to dependencies of the IMF/WB and foreign financial consortia. The defeat of the “third world” bloc in 1982 allowed the US-led Western bloc to exploit “international civil society” into a campaign against global Keynesianism. From 1984 to the 1990s, however, global Reaganomics, the instability of the financial markets, the fall of the dollar, worsening US deficit, etc. posed serious problems to the US maintenance of hegemony over the Western bloc. Despite the success, and somewhat precipitous collapse, of the Asian Newly Industrializing Countries, the “third world” as an independent actor, with its own singular interests and aspirations, has virtually disappeared from the world scene. **Postcolonial theory, whose provenance owes more to finance capital than has heretofore been understood, serves to compensate for this disappearance. But wherever neocolonialism** (Woddis 1972) **prevails, the ideal and practice of national liberation will continue to thrive.**

**The history of slavery proves that race is merely a symptom of capital—any discussion of racism must first start at the violent history of capital accumulation**

**Tom Keefer, member of Facing Reality, in New Socialist Magazine, January 2003. http://www.newsocialist.org/magazine/39/article03.html**

The brutality and viciousness of capitalism is well known to the oppressed and exploited of this world. Billions of people throughout the world spend their lives incessantly toiling to enrich the already wealthy, while throughout history any serious attempts to build alternatives to capitalism have been met with bombings, invasions, and blockades by imperialist nation states. Although the modern day ideologues of the mass media and of institutions such as the World Bank and IMF never cease to inveigh against scattered acts of violence perpetrated against their system, they always neglect to mention that the capitalist system they lord over was called into existence and has only been able to maintain itself by the sustained application of systematic violence. It should come as no surprise that **this capitalist system**, which we can only hope is now reaching the era of its final demise, **was just as rapacious** and vicious **in its youth as it is now. The "rosy dawn" of capitalist production was inaugurated by the process of slavery and genocide in the western hemisphere**, and this "primitive accumulation of capital" resulted in the largest systematic murder of human beings ever seen. However, **the rulers of society have found that naked force is often most economically used in conjunction with ideologies of domination and control which provide a legitimizing explanation for the oppressive nature of society. Racism is such a construct** and it came into being as a social relation which condoned and secured the initial genocidal processes of capitalist accumulation--the founding stones of contemporary bourgeois society. While it is widely accepted that the embryonic capitalist class came to power in the great bourgeois revolutions of the 17th and 18th centuries, what is comparatively less well known is the crucial role that chattel slavery and the plunder of the "New World" played in calling this class into being and providing the "primitive accumulation of capital" necessary to launch and sustain industrialization in Europe. The accidental "discovery" of the Western Hemisphere by the mass murderer Christopher Columbus in 1492 changed everything for the rival economic and political interests of the European states. The looting and pillaging of the "New World" destabilized the European social order, as Spain raised huge armies and built armadas with the unending streams of gold and silver coming from the "New World", the spending of which devalued the currency reserves of its rivals. The only way Portugal, England, Holland, and France could stay ahead in the regional power games of Europe was to embark on their own colonial ventures. **In addition to the extraction of precious minerals and the looting** and pillaging **of indigenous societies, European merchant-adventurers realized that substantial profits could also be made through the production of cash crops** on the fertile lands surrounding the Caribbean sea. The only problem was that as the indigenous population either fled from enslavement or perished from the diseases and deprivations of the Europeans, **there was no one left to raise the** sugar, tobacco, cotton, indigo, and other **tropical cash crops that were so profitable. A system of waged labour would not work** for the simple reason that **with plentiful land and easy means of subsistence surrounding them, colonists would naturally prefer small scale homesteading instead of labouring for their masters**. As the planter Emanuel Downing of Massachusetts put it in 1645: "I do not see how we can thrive until we get a stock of slaves sufficient to do all our business, for our children's children will hardly see this great continent filled with people so that our servants will still desire freedom to plant for themselves, and not stay but for very great wages." **Capitalistic social relations have always been based on compulsion, and they require as a precondition that workers possess nothing but their capacity to labour**. The would-be developers of the wealth of the "New World" thus turned to forced labour in complete contradiction to all the theories of bourgeois economists because unfree labour was the only kind of labour applicable to the concrete situation in the Americas. **Although slavery is now**, and has almost always been **equated with unfree Black labour, it was not** always, or even **predominantly so. Capitalists looked first to their own societies in order to find the population to labour in servitude on the large-scale plantations necessary for tropical cash crop production**. Eric Williams, in his groundbreaking work Capitalism and Slavery, noted that in the early stages of colonialism "white slavery was the historic base upon which Negro [sic] slavery was constructed." Between 1607 and 1783 over a quarter million "white" indentured servants arrived in the British colonies alone where they were set to work in the agricultural and industrial processes of the time. The shipping companies, ports, and trading routes established for the transport of the poor, "criminal", and lumpen elements of European society were to form the backbone of the future slave trade of Africans. **Slavery became an exclusively Black institution due to the dynamics of class struggle as repeated multi-ethnic rebellions** of African slaves and indentured European servants **led the slaveholders to seek strategies to divide and conquer**. The fact that an African slave could be purchased for life with the same amount of money that it would cost to buy an indentured servant for 10 years, and **that the African's skin color would function as an instrument of social control by making it easier to track down runaway slaves** in a land where all whites were free wage labourers and all Black people slaves, **provided further incentives for this system of racial classification**. In the colonies where there was an insufficient free white population to provide a counterbalance to potential slave insurgencies, such as on the Caribbean islands, an elaborate hierarchy of racial privilege was built up, with the lighter skinned "mulattos" admitted to the ranks of free men where they often owned slaves themselves. **The concept of a "white race" never really existed before the economic systems of early capitalism made it a necessary social construct to aid in the repression of enslaved Africans**. Xenophobia and hostility towards those who were different than one's own immediate family, clan, or tribe were certainly evident, and discrimination based on religious status was also widespread but the development of modern "scientific" racism with its view that there are physically distinct "races" within humanity, with distinct attributes and characteristics is peculiar to the conquest of the Americas, the rise of slavery, and the imperialist domination of the entire world. **Racism provided a convenient way to explain the subordinate position of Africans and other victims** of Euro-colonialism**, while at the same time providing an apparatus upon which to structure the granting of special privileges to sectors of the working class** admitted as members of the "white race". As David McNally has noted, one of the key component of modern racism was its utility in resolving the contradiction as to how the modern European societies in which the bourgeoisie had come to power through promising "freedom" and "equality" were so reliant on slave labour and murderous, yet highly profitable colonial adventures. **The development of** a concept like **racism allowed whole sections of the world's population to be "excommunicated" from humankind, and then be murdered or worked to death with a clear conscience for the profit of the capitalist class**. To get a sense of the scale of slavery and its economic importance, and thus an understanding of the material incentives for the creation of ideological constructs such as "race", a few statistics regarding the English slave trade from Eric Williams' book Capitalism and Slavery help to put things in context. The Royal African Company, a monopolistic crown corporation, transported an average of 5 000 slaves a year between 1680 and 1686. When the ability to engage in the free trade of slaves was recognized as a "fundamental and natural right" of the Englishman, one port city alone, Bristol, shipped 160 950 slaves from 1698-1707. In 1760, 146 slave ships with a capacity for 36 000 slaves sailed from British ports, while in 1771 that number had increased to 190 ships with a capacity for 47 000 slaves. Between 1700 and 1786 over 610 000 slaves were imported to Jamaica alone, and conservative estimates for the total import of slaves into all British colonies between 1680 and 1786 are put at over two million. All told, many historians place the total number of Africans displaced by the Atlantic slave trade as being between twelve and thirty million people--a massive historical event and forced migration of unprecedented proportions. These large numbers of slaves and the success of the slave trade as jump starter for capitalist industrialization came from what has been called the "triangular trade"--an intensely profitable economic relationship which built up European industry while systematically deforming and underdeveloping the other economic regions involved. The Europeans would produce manufactured goods that would then be traded to ruling elites in the various African kingdoms. They in turn would use the firearms and trading goods of the Europeans to enrich themselves by capturing members of rival tribes, or the less fortunate of their own society, to sell them as slaves to the European merchants who would fill their now empty ships with slaves destined to work in the colonial plantations. On the plantations, the slaves would toil to produce expensive cash crops that could not be grown in Europe. These raw materials were then refined and sold at fantastic profit in Europe. In 1697, the tiny island of Barbados with its 166 square miles, was worth more to British capitalism than New England, New York, and Pennsylvania combined, while by 1798, the income accruing to the British from the West Indian plantations alone was four million pounds a year, as opposed to one million pounds from the whole rest of the world. Capitalist economists of the day recognized the super profitability of slavery by noting the ease of making 100% profit on the trade, and by noting that one African slave was as profitable as seven workers in the mainland. Even more importantly, the profits of the slave trade were plowed back into further economic growth. Capital from the slave trade financed James Watt and the invention and production of the steam engine, while the shipping, insurance, banking, mining, and textile industries were all thoroughly integrated into the slave trade. **What an analysis of the origins of modern capitalism shows is just how far the capitalist class will go** to make a profit**. The development of a pernicious racist ideology, spread to justify the uprooting and enslavement of millions of people to transport them across the world to fill a land whose indigenous population was massacred or worked to death, represents the beginnings of the system** that George W. Bush defends as "our way of life". **For revolutionaries today who seek to understand and transform capitalism and the racism encoded into its very being, it is essential to understand how and why these systems of domination and exploitation came into being before we can hope to successfully overthrow them.**

**The material determinism of capital is responsible for the instrumentalization of all life—makes all oppression inevitable.**

**Dyer-Witherford** (professor of Library and Info. Sciences @ the Univ. of Western Ontarion) **‘99** [Nick. Cyber Marx: Cycles and Circuits of Struggle in High Technology Capitalism.]

**For capitalism, the use of machines as organs of “will over nature” is an imperative**. The great insight of the Frankfurt School—an insight subsequently improved and amplified by feminists and ecologists—was that **capital’s dual project of dominating both humanity and nature was intimately tied to the cultivation of “instrumental reason” that systematically objectifies, reduces, quantifies and fragments the world for the purposes of technological control. Business’s systemic need to cheapen labor, cut the costs of raw materials, and expand consumer markets gives it an inherent bias toward the piling-up of technological power. This priority—enshrined in phrases such as “progress,” “efficiency,” “productivity,” “modernization,” and “growth”—assumes an automatism that is used to override any objection or alternative, regardless of the environmental and social consequences. Today, we witness global vistas of toxification, deforestation, desertification, dying oceans, disappearing ozone layers, and disintegrating immune systems, all interacting in ways that perhaps threaten the very existence of humanity and are undeniably inflicting social collapse, disease, and immiseration across the planet**. The degree to which this project of mastery has backfired is all too obvious.

**Reject the aff to validate and adopt the method of structural/historical criticism that is the 1NC.**

one must understand the existing social totality before one can act on it—grounding the sites of political contestation or knowledge outside of labor and surplus value merely serve to humynize capital and prevent a transition to a society beyond oppression

**Tumino** (Prof. English @ Pitt) **01**

[Stephen, “What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More than Ever”, Red Critiqu]

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

### 1NC

**Counterplan: Thus, we advocate black liberation as resistance to the regime of targeted killing.**

**The discourse of strategy reproduces a body of knowledge concerning a form of social organization that is explicitly masculinist and militaristic. It reproduces micro-violence of both discourses-directly influences how their liberation extends to new contexts.**

Eero **Vaara**, Professor of Economics, “Taking the Linguistic Turn Seriously: Strategy as a Multifaceted Interdiscursive Phenomenon” **2010**, p. 7-9

**These discussions include all kinds of interactions in both formal and informal arenas**. Naturally, **these discussions** do not always have to correspond to the most classical face-to-face meetings, but can **include**, for example, **chats, emails or other specific interaction modes**. Importantly, in these discussions, broader ideas and organization-specific narratives can also be contested.¶ It is important to emphasize that these three facets are inter-linked in various ways. From a top-down perspective, **we are dealing with a meta-discourse, the essential ideas and ideological assumptions of which tend to form the basis for organizational discourses about strategy.** **These organizational level discourses** such as narratives, in turn, **tend to greatly influence any discussion** about strategy in a specific organizational context. For example, in the body of knowledge, **conventional** institutionalized **views** on strategy **often involve militaristic conceptions where the role of top managers is to lead and others to follow the leaders without questioning their authority** (Knights and Morgan, 1991; Mantere and Vaara, 2008; see also Suominen and Mantere, this volume). In organizational discourses, **such conceptions may be used to construct heroic future-oriented narratives about conquests led by specific top managers.** In micro-level conversations, **these views may then be actualized in terms that portray strategy as „warfare‟ or „battle‟ where the top managers act as „commanders‟ and the „troops‟ or „men in the field‟ implement the strategies** (Mantere and Vaara, 2008; Suominen and Mantere, this volume).¶ From a bottom-up perspective, it is the micro-level conversations that give life to the organizational level discourses such as narratives of strategy. These organizational-level discourses, in turn, when taken across various organizations, feed back to and often reify the meta-level ideas and the ideological elements in this body of knowledge. To continue with the previous example, **if the micro-level conversations use terms such as „commanders‟ or „men in the field,‟ this usage reproduces specific narratives in the organization in question and more generally managerial heroism and masculine values in strategy** (Knights and Morgan, 1991). However, if the discussions turn to use other kinds of terms to conceptualize strategy, forexample emphasizing „collaboration,‟ „networking,‟ „co-creation,‟ or „search for meaning,‟ they provides alternatives to the militaristic narratives and broader conceptions of strategy.

### Case

**Monolithic discourses of whiteness ignore intersections of oppression**

**Rasmussen, Et al, 2001** Birgit Brander Rasmussen, PhD, Dept. of Comparative and Ethnic Studies, UCal-Berkeley, “Introduction,” The making and unmaking of whiteness, pp. 7-8,

As these recent debates over resources and opportunities in California make clear, **it is important to be critically attentive to the language used to make claims about race and race-based privilege**. The shift from "affirmative action" to "racial preferences" was more than a linguistic shift. It also reinforced a political consolidation of previously disparate groups of white and conservative people of color voters. In this campaign it became clear that **monolithic notions of whiteness not only oversimplified the issues and did a disservice to the ways in which race intersected with other axes of social power and inequality**—they also hampered the ability of those struggling to maintain affirma­tive action to mount an effective political countercampaign. **Definitions of whiteness, as many contributors to this book argue, will always be dynamic and context-specific.**This is why the work of explaining what happened to the groups who "became white" but who did not profit from it is becoming a more important part of the study of whiteness. For example, the question of how whites themselves are internally differentiated, how the same white skin that has facilitated the integration, assimilation, and enrichment of some docs not guarantee that others—such as poor whites and queer whites—might not also experience deprivation, stigmatization, and subjugation.16 Scholars of “multiraciality" have helped to show how race is simultaneously connected to and disconnected from bodies and narratives about bodies, especially when those bodies can "pass" for while. Moreover, scholars of sexuality and difference, such as Cherne Moraga, have argued that lesbian or gay whiteness does not guarantee. nor does it entirely abrogate, access to white skin privilege.17

**Monolithic interpretations of whiteness are bad**

**Visano, 2002**L. A. Visano, Professor, Criminology, Dept of Social Science, York University, “The Impact of Whiteness on the Culture of Law: From Theory to Practice,” Working through whiteness: international perspectives, pp. 209-210,

**Whiteness is a complexly articulated plurality of discourses that are never static but rather ongoing** accomplishments of **cultural processes. Whiteness is not a monolithic, homogeneous, nor absolutist category**(Delgado 1995). Rather, **whiteness,** as a social construct**, acquires meaning in reference to its active relatedness or forms of dynamic embeddedness. Whiteness is a fragmentary set of assumptions about privilege rooted well within structures of dominance**(Gates 1985). As an ideology, however, whiteness universalizes identities and common sense notions of rightness. The prevailing ideology of whiteness incor­porates assimilation as a moral project. The social meanings attributed to whiteness articulate a liberal ethos that appropriates common sense or "naturalized" assumptions about differences, defiance, and danger. The display of a contrived consensus is evident in law and the banter of liberalism, which purport to ignore color differences. The cultural prac­tices of law recognize all too well the politics of identity differences as routine responses to domination, that is, as people live out their respec­tive subject positions.

**They elevate whiteness to near all-pervasive force driving most oppression. Such conceptual expansion hides the actual practice of racism and makes breaking it down more difficult**

**Andersen 3** – Margaret L. Andersen, Professor of Sociology and Women's Studies and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs at the University of Delaware, 2003, “Whitewashing Race: A Critical Perspective on Whiteness,” in White Out: The Continuing Significance of Racism, ed Doane & Bonilla-Silva, p. 30-32

Conceptually, **one of the major problemsin the whiteness literature is the reification of whiteness as a concept, as an experience, and as an identity. This practice not only leads to conceptual obfuscation but also impedes**the possibility**for empirical analysis. In this literature, "whiteness" comes to mean just about everything associated with racial domination. As such, whiteness becomes a slippery and elusive concept**. Whiteness is presented as any or all of the following: identity, self-understanding, social practices, group beliefs, ideology, and a system of domination. As one critic writes, "**If historical actors are said to have behaved the way they did mainly because they were white, then there's little room left for more nuanced analysis of their motives and meanings**" (Stowe 1996:77). And Alastair Bonnett points out that **whiteness** "**emerges from this critique as an omnipresent and all-powerful historical force. Whiteness is seen to be responsible for the failure of socialism to develop in America, for racism, for the impoverishment of humanity**. With the 'blame' comes a new kind of centering: Whiteness, and White people, are turned into the key agents of historical change, the shapers of contemporary America" (1996b: 153). **Despite noting that there is differentiation among whites and warning against using whiteness as a monolithic category, most of the literature still proceeds to do so, revealing a reductionist tendency. Even claiming to show its multiple forms**, most **writers essentialize and reify whiteness as something that directs most of Western history** (Gallagher 2000). **Hence while trying to "deconstruct" whiteness and see the ubiquitousness of whiteness**, the literature at the same time reasserts and reinstates it (Stowe 1996:77). For example, Michael Eric **Dyson suggests that whiteness is identity, ideology, and institution**(Dyson, quoted in Chennault 1998:300). **But if it is all these things, it becomes an analytically useless concept**. Christine Clark and James O'Donnell write: "to reference it reifies it, to refrain from referencing it obscures the persistent, pervasive, and seemingly permanent reality of racism" (1999:2). **Empirical investigation requires being able to identify and measure a concept— or at the very least to have a clear definition—but since whiteness has come to mean just about everything, it ends up meaning hardly anything**.

## 2NC

### Marx Link: Identiity (Hennessey) 2NC

#### Focusing on race masks the perpetuation of capitalism—only by starting with capital can we overcome racism

Hooks 2K

(Bell, Author. Routledge “Where We Stand: Class Matters.”)

Pg7 Class matters. Race and gender can be used as screens to deflect attention away from the harsh realities class politics exposes. Clearly, just when we should all be paying attention to class, using race and gender to understand and explain its new dimensions, society, even our government, says let's talk about race and racial injustice. It is impossible to talk meaningfully about ending racism without talking about class. Let us not be duped. Let us not be led by spectacles like the 0. J. Simpson trial to believe a mass media, which has always betrayed the cause of racial justice, to think that it was all about race, or it was about gender. Let us acknowledge that first and foremost it was about class and the interlocking nature of race, sex, and class. Let's face the reality that if 0. J. Simpson had been poor or even lower middle class there would have been no media attention. Justice was never the central issue. Our nation's tabloid passion to know about the lives of the rich made class the starting point. It began with money and became a media spectacle that made more money another case of the rich getting richer. The Simpson trial is credited with upping the GNP by two hundred million dollars. Racism and sexism can be exploited in the interests of class power. Yet no one wants to talk about class. It is not sexy or cute. Better to make it seem that justice is class-free-that what happened to O.J. could happen to any working man

#### American racism is a function of the planter elite fracturing the working class in the 1700’s

Bacon’s rebellion

**Alexander 10** (The new Jim Crow: mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness, Michelle Alexander is an associate professor of law at [Ohio State University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ohio_State_University) and a [civil rights](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civil_and_political_rights) advocate, who has litigated numerous [class action](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Class_action) discrimination cases and has worked on [criminal justice](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Criminal_justice) reform issues. She is a recipient of a 2005 Soros Justice Fellowship of the [Open Society Institute](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_Society_Institute), has served as director of the Racial Justice Project at the [ACLU](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Civil_Liberties_Union) of Northern [California](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/California), directed the Civil Rights Clinic at [Stanford](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stanford_University) Law School and was a law clerk for Justice [Harry Blackmun](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harry_Blackmun) at the [U. S. Supreme Court](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Supreme_Court_of_the_United_States).)

The concept of race is a relatively recent development. Only in the past few centuries, owing largely to European imperialism, have the world’s people been classified along racial lines. Here, in America, the idea of race emerged as a means of reconciling chattel slavery- as well as the extermination of American Indians – with the ideals of freedom preached by whites in the new colonies. In the early colonial period, when settlements remained relatively small, indentured servitude was the dominant means of securing cheap labor. Under this system, whites and blacks struggled to survive against a common enemy, what historian Lerone Bennett Jr. describes as “the big planter apparatus and a social system that legalized terror against black and white bondsmen.” Initially, blacks brought to this country were not all enslaved; many were treated as indentured servants. As plantation farming expanded, particularly tobacco and cotton farming, demand increased greatly for both labor and land. The demand for land was met by invading and conquering larger and large swaths of territory. American Indians became a growing impediment to white European “progress,” and during this period, the images of American Indians promoted in books, newspapers, and magazines became increasingly negative. As sociologists Keith Kilty and Eric Swank have observed, eliminating “savages” is less of a moral problem than eliminating human beings, and therefore American Indians came to be understood as a lesser race- uncivilized savages- thus providing a justification for the extermination of the native peoples. The growing demand for labor on plantations was met through slavery. American Indians were considered unsuitable as slaves, largely because native tribes were clearly in a position to fight back. The fear of raids by Indian tribes left plantation owners to grasp for an alternative source of free labor. European immigrants were also deemed poor candidates for slavery, not because of their race, but rather because they were in short supply and enslavement would, quite naturally, interfere with voluntary immigration to the new colonies. Plantation owners thus view Africans, who were relatively powerless, as the ideal slaves. The systemic enslavement of Africans, and the rearing of their children under bondage, emerged with all deliberate speed- quickened by events such as Bacon’s Rebellion. Nathaniel Bacon was a white property owner in Jamestown, Virginia, who managed to united slaves, indentured servants, and poor whites in a revolutionary effort to overthrow the planter elite. Although slaves clearly occupied the lowest position in the social hierarchy and suffered the most under the plantation, the condition of indentured whites was barely better, and the majority of free whites lived in extreme poverty. As explained by historian Edmund Morgan, in colonies like Virginia, the planter elite, with huge land grants, occupied a vastly superior position to workers of all colors. Southern colonies did not hesitate to invent ways to extend the terms of servitude, and the planter class accumulated uncultivated lands to restrict the options of free workers. The simmering resentment against the planter class created conditions that were ripe for revolt. Varying accounts of Bacon’s rebellion abound, but the basic facts are these: Bacon developed plans in 1675 to seize Native American lands in order to acquire more property for himself and others and nullify the threat of Indian raids. When the planter elite in Virginia refused to provide militia support for his scheme, Bacon retaliated, leading to an attack on the elite, their homes, and their property. He openly condemned the rich for their oppression of the poor and inspired an alliance of white and black bond laborers, as well as slaves, who demanded an end to their servitude. The attempted revolution was ended by force and false promises of amnesty. A number of the people who participated in the revolt were hanged. The events in Jamestown were alarming to the planter elite, who were deeply fearful of the multiracial alliance of bond workers and slave. Word of Bacon’s rebellion spread far and wide, and several more uprisings of a similar type followed. In an effort to protect their superior status and economic position, the planters shifted their strategy for maintaining dominance. They abandoned their heavy reliance on indentured servants in favor of the importation of more black slaves. Instead of importing English-speaking slaves from the West Indies, who were more likely to be familiar with European language and culture, many more slaves were shipped directly from Africa. These slaves would be far easier to control and far less likely to form alliances with poor whites. Fearful that such measures might not be sufficient to protect their interests, the planter class took an additional precautionary step, a step that would later come to be known as a “racial bribe.” Deliberately and strategically, the planter class extended special privileges to poor whites in an effort to drive a wedge between them and black slaves. White settlers were allowed greater access to Native American lands, white servants were allowed to police slaves through slave patrols and militias, and barriers were created so that free labor would not be placed in competition with slave labor. These measures effectively eliminated the risk of future alliances between black slaves and poor whites. Poor whites suddenly had a direct, personal stake in the existence of a race-based system of slavery. Their own plight had not improved by much, but at least they were not slaves. Once the planter elite split the labor force, poor whites responded to the logic of their situation and sought ways to expand their racially privileged position. By the mid-1770s, the system of bond labor had been thoroughly transformed into a racial caste system predicated on slavery. The degraded status of Africans was justified on the ground that Negros, like the Indians, were an uncivilized lesser race, perhaps even more lacking in intelligence and laudable human qualities than the red-skinned natives. The notion of white supremacy rationalized the enslavement of Africans, even as whites endeavored to form a new nation based on the ideals of equality, liberty, and justice for all. Before democracy, chattel slavery was born.

### Filipino

#### We explain the filipines and the alt solves better

PRWC 93 Philippine Revolution Web Central“Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought as Guide to the Philippine Revolution”¶ Contribution to the International Seminar on Mao Zedong Thought, November 6-7, 1993 http://www.philippinerevolution.net/documents/marxism-leninism-mao-zedong-thought-as-guide-to-the-philippine-revolution

November 06, 1993

In 1959, a few young men and women, independent of the old merger party of the Communist and Socialist Parties, started forming study circles to read and study the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Zedong that could be gotten from secret collections. They initially did so amidst the open and legal studies about the problems of national independence and democracy. The Marxist-Leninist works that they read included the Communist Manifesto, Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, Wages, Prices and Pro fit, The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism, Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism, Two Tactics of Social Democracy, State and Revolution, The Foundations of Leninism, the Analysis of Classes in Chinese Society and Talks at the Yenan Forum on Art and Literature.¶ The most avid students of Marxism-Leninism read and studied Das Kapital, The Dialectics of Nature, Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, History of the CPSU (Bolsheviks), Short Course; the first edition of the Soviet-published Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and the Selected Works of Mao Zedong. The volumes of the selected works of the great communists began to reach the Philippines in 1962. To get hold of Marxist reading materials in the period of 1959-62 was by itself an achievement in view of the anticommunist hysteria and repressive measures since the end of World War II.¶ The objective of the beginners in the study of Marxism-Leninism was to seek solutions to what they perceived as the fundamental problems of the Filipino people, use Marxism-Leninism to shed light on the history and concrete circumstances of the Filipino people and find ways to resume the Philippine revolution and carry it out until victory. In the study of Marxism-Leninism, with special reference to the Philippine revolution, they sought to grasp the three components of Marxism, which are materialist philosophy, political economy and scientific socialism as laid down by Marx and Engels, developed by Lenin and Stalin and further developed by Mao Zedong.¶ The beginners in the study of proletarian revolutionary theory were exceedingly receptive to Mao’s teachings because of their proven correctness and success in so vast a country neighboring the Philippines and their recognized applicability to the Philippines. The most read works of Mao Zedong were On Contradiction, On Practice, the Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society, The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War, Problems of Strategy in Guerrilla War Against Japan, On Protracted People’s War and On New Democracy.¶ In the light of Mao’s teachings, the Filipino proletarian revolutionaries could define clearly the periods of Philippine history; the precolonial communities until the 16th century; the colonial and feudal society until the end of Spanish colonialism; the colonial and semifeudal society under U.S. imperialism until 1946; and the semicolonial and semifeudal society which has continued to this day since 1946.¶ The semicolonial and semifeudal character of present-day Philippine society is basically similar to that of China before the 1949. This is a society ruled by the joint class dictatorship of the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class, which are subservient to the foreign monopoly bourgeoisie. The basic oppressed classes are the working class and the peasantry, which in the main produce the surplus product appropriated by the basic exploiting classes. The intermediate social strata are the urban petty bourgeoisie and the middle or national bourgeoisie.¶ The social economy is mainly agrarian, semifeudal and preindustrial. There is some import-dependent manufacturing undertaken by the imperialists and the big compradors but there are no basic industries producing basic metals, basic chemicals, machine tools and precision instruments to qualify the Philippines as a “newly industrializing country”. The economy is principally dependent on agricultural production for domestic staples and exports; and secondarily on the production of raw minerals for export. Even today, import-dependent and low value-added manufacturing for reexport is a showy but negligible part of the economy, providing little or no net income for the country because of transfer-pricing.¶ Correspondent to the semicolonial and semifeudal character of Philippine society, a national democratic revolution is required in order to liberate the Filipino people from foreign and feudal domination. It is a democratic revolution of a new type because it is no longer led by the bourgeoisie but by the proletariat in the historical context of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution or the world proletarian-socialist revolution; and it can proceed from the democratic revolution to the socialist revolution under the class leadership of the proletariat.¶ The motive forces of the revolution are the working class comprising about 15 percent of the population; the peasantry, at least 75 percent; the urban petty bourgeoisie, about 8 percent; and the middle bourgeoisie, about one percent. These are the motive forces of the revolution fighting to overthrow such class enemies as the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class that comprise fractions of one percent of the population.¶ The working class is the leading class because it is the most advanced productive and political force. For this class to carry out its historic mission, it must have an advance detachment such as the Communist Party of the Philippines, armed with the revolutionary theory of the proletariat and pursuing the general political line that can arouse, organize and mobilize the broad masses of the people against the enemies of national and social liberation.¶ The proletariat through the Party overcomes its being a minority in the population and draws the overwhelming majority of the people to the revolutionary cause by linking up with the peasant masses in order to develop them as the main force of the revolution and form the basic worker-peasant alliance encompassing at least 90 percent of the people. The proletarian revolutionary cadres deployed in the countryside rely mainly on the poor peasants, lower-middle peasants and farm workers, win over the middle peasants and neutralize the rich peasants, take advantage of the splits between the enlightened and despotic landlords in order to isolate and destroy the power of the latter.¶ In pursuing the antifeudal class line, the proletarian revolutionary cadres and the peasant masses must fulfill the main content of the new-democratic revolution, namely the solution of the land problem. To do so, they have to carry out revolutionary armed struggle, land reform and mass-base building as integral components of the protracted people’s war in the new-democratic revolution.¶ The semicolonial and semifeudal society is in chronic crisis. On the basis of this concrete fact, the armed revolution can and must be waged. The peasant masses are an inexhaustible source of support for the people’s war led by the proletariat through its advance detachment, the Communist Party. The countryside provides the revolutionary forces with a vast field of maneuver for its growth in stages and accumulation of strength until it becomes possible to seize the cities. Even while the enemy is still well entrenched in the cities, Red political power can be built in the countryside.¶ The urban petty bourgeoisie is a smaller minority of the population than the proletariat. But this stratum of the bourgeoisie is highly instrumental in assisting the exploiting classes to rule society. It is highly influential in society. It is therefore absolutely necessary to win over sections if not the entirety of it in order to tilt the balance in favor of the revolutionary movement. The urban petty bourgeoisie is relatively the most exploited stratum of the bourgeoisie. In going over to the side of the revolution, it can become a basic force of the revolution.¶ The middle or national bourgeoisie is another bourgeois stratum, far thinner than the urban petty bourgeoisie. It is economically and politically weak, particularly in the Philippines, due to the lack of basic industries. It has a dual character. In pursuit of its legitimate but selfish interests, it is capable of opposing imperialism and feudalism. But at the same time, it participates in the exploitation of the working classes, wishes to gain power for itself and distrusts the masses. However, it can still be induced to become a positive force of the revolution, if the proletariat through the Communist Party of the Philippines has, in the first place, successfully built the basic worker-peasant alliance and, in the second place, won over the urban petty bourgeoisie.¶ It is also part of the revolutionary class line in the armed struggle and the united front to take advantage of the splits among the factions of the reactionary classes of the big compradors and landlords. The internal contradictions of the exploiting classes weaken their class rule and indirectly aid the advance of the revolutionary movement. When internecine conflicts arise among the reactionaries, it becomes possible to further isolate and range the widest array of forces against the ruling clique, which is usually the most reactionary and the most subservient to the foreign monopoly capitalists.¶ In the simplest of terms, the program of the new-democratic revolution is to overthrow foreign and feudal domination and to effect national liberation and democracy. Upon the nationwide seizure of political power, the new-democratic revolution is basically completed and the socialist revolution can begin. We therefore speak of two stages in the ongoing Philippine revolution: national democratic and socialist. These are continuous but distinct stages.¶ In the course of winning power through the new-democratic revolution, the prerequisites for subsequently making socialist revolution are prepared and developed. The state that arises after the nationwide seizure of political power takes the form of people’s democracy which is founded on the basic worker-peasant alliance. But the new state is under the leadership of the proletariat and at its core is the proletarian dictatorship.¶ The capital and landed assets of the imperialists and the local reactionary classes are nationalized or put into the public sector. All strategic enterprises, main sources of raw materials and main lines of distribution are likewise put into the public sector or placed under state ownership. The agrarian revolution is completed and cooperativization is carried out in stages. Socialist industries are built and socialist education is carried out. Concessions are extended to the petty-bourgeoisie and the middle bourgeoisie for a certain time but the consistent and relentless objective is to realize the socialist transformation.¶ In most of the 1960’s the proletarian revolutionary cadres learnt the principles of the new-democratic revolution from the teachings and successful experience of the Chinese revolution led by Comrade Mao Zedong. These encompass the character of Philippine society and the current stage of the revolution, the motive forces and targets, the tasks, and the socialist perspective of the revolution.¶ In 1959, a few young men and women, independent of the old merger party of the Communist and Socialist Parties, started forming study circles to read and study the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Zedong that could be gotten from secret collections. They initially did so amidst the open and legal studies about the problems of national independence and democracy. The Marxist-Leninist works that they read included the Communist Manifesto, Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, Wages, Prices and Pro fit, The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism, Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism, Two Tactics of Social Democracy, State and Revolution, The Foundations of Leninism, the Analysis of Classes in Chinese Society and Talks at the Yenan Forum on Art and Literature.¶ The most avid students of Marxism-Leninism read and studied Das Kapital, The Dialectics of Nature, Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, History of the CPSU (Bolsheviks), Short Course; the first edition of the Soviet-published Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and the Selected Works of Mao Zedong. The volumes of the selected works of the great communists began to reach the Philippines in 1962. To get hold of Marxist reading materials in the period of 1959-62 was by itself an achievement in view of the anticommunist hysteria and repressive measures since the end of World War II.¶ The objective of the beginners in the study of Marxism-Leninism was to seek solutions to what they perceived as the fundamental problems of the Filipino people, use Marxism-Leninism to shed light on the history and concrete circumstances of the Filipino people and find ways to resume the Philippine revolution and carry it out until victory. In the study of Marxism-Leninism, with special reference to the Philippine revolution, they sought to grasp the three components of Marxism, which are materialist philosophy, political economy and scientific socialism as laid down by Marx and Engels, developed by Lenin and Stalin and further developed by Mao Zedong.¶ The beginners in the study of proletarian revolutionary theory were exceedingly receptive to Mao’s teachings because of their proven correctness and success in so vast a country neighboring the Philippines and their recognized applicability to the Philippines. The most read works of Mao Zedong were On Contradiction, On Practice, the Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society, The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War, Problems of Strategy in Guerrilla War Against Japan, On Protracted People’s War and On New Democracy.¶ In the light of Mao’s teachings, the Filipino proletarian revolutionaries could define clearly the periods of Philippine history; the precolonial communities until the 16th century; the colonial and feudal society until the end of Spanish colonialism; the colonial and semifeudal society under U.S. imperialism until 1946; and the semicolonial and semifeudal society which has continued to this day since 1946.¶ The semicolonial and semifeudal character of present-day Philippine society is basically similar to that of China before the 1949. This is a society ruled by the joint class dictatorship of the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class, which are subservient to the foreign monopoly bourgeoisie. The basic oppressed classes are the working class and the peasantry, which in the main produce the surplus product appropriated by the basic exploiting classes. The intermediate social strata are the urban petty bourgeoisie and the middle or national bourgeoisie.¶ The social economy is mainly agrarian, semifeudal and preindustrial. There is some import-dependent manufacturing undertaken by the imperialists and the big compradors but there are no basic industries producing basic metals, basic chemicals, machine tools and precision instruments to qualify the Philippines as a “newly industrializing country”. The economy is principally dependent on agricultural production for domestic staples and exports; and secondarily on the production of raw minerals for export. Even today, import-dependent and low value-added manufacturing for reexport is a showy but negligible part of the economy, providing little or no net income for the country because of transfer-pricing.¶ Correspondent to the semicolonial and semifeudal character of Philippine society, a national democratic revolution is required in order to liberate the Filipino people from foreign and feudal domination. It is a democratic revolution of a new type because it is no longer led by the bourgeoisie but by the proletariat in the historical context of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution or the world proletarian-socialist revolution; and it can proceed from the democratic revolution to the socialist revolution under the class leadership of the proletariat.¶ The motive forces of the revolution are the working class comprising about 15 percent of the population; the peasantry, at least 75 percent; the urban petty bourgeoisie, about 8 percent; and the middle bourgeoisie, about one percent. These are the motive forces of the revolution fighting to overthrow such class enemies as the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class that comprise fractions of one percent of the population.¶ The working class is the leading class because it is the most advanced productive and political force. For this class to carry out its historic mission, it must have an advance detachment such as the Communist Party of the Philippines, armed with the revolutionary theory of the proletariat and pursuing the general political line that can arouse, organize and mobilize the broad masses of the people against the enemies of national and social liberation.

### Marx v Race: A2 “Perm”

#### Praxis DA

Tumino (Prof. English @ Pitt) 01

[Stephen, “What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More than Ever”, Red Critiqu]

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

#### Perm kills solvency more than pure Marxism or pure antiracism

Mike **Cole**, “Critical Race Theory and Education: A Marxist Response” 20**09**. p. 33

Antiracists have made some progress, in the United Kingdom at least, after years of ‘establishment’ opposition, in making antiracism a mainstream rallying point, and this is reflected, in part, in legislation (e.g., the (2000) Race Relations Amendment Act).11 Even if it were a good idea, the chances of making ‘the abolition of whiteness’ a successful political unifier and rallying point against racism are virtually non-existent. For John Preston (2007, p. 13), ‘[t]he abolition of whiteness is . . . not just an optional extra in terms of defeating capitalism (nor something which will be necessarily abolished post-capitalism) but fundamental to the Marxist educational project as praxis’. Indeed, for Preston (2007, p. 196) ‘[t]he abolition of capitalism and whiteness seem to be fundamentally connected in the current historical circumstances of Western capitalist development’. From a Marxist perspective, coupling the ‘abolition of whiteness’ to the ‘abolition of capitalism’ is a worrying development which, if it gained ground in Marxist theory in any substantial way would most certainly undermine the Marxist project, even more than it has been undermined already (for an analysis of the success of the Ruling Class in forging consensus to capitalism in the United Kingdom, see Cole, 2008g, 2008h). Implications of bringing the ‘abolition of whiteness’ into schools are discussed in chapter 7 of this volume. As is argued in this volume, racism, xeno-racism, racialization, and xeno-racialization, when informed by Marxism, are far more conducive to understanding racism in contemporary societies than is the CRT concept of ‘white supremacy’. ‘White supremacy’, I believe, should be restricted to its conventional usage.

## 1NR

### FW: Limits—Decision-Making 2NC

#### Effective deliberation is the lynchpin of solving all existential global problems

**Lundberg 10** - Christian O. Lundberg 10 Professor of Communications @ University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, “Tradition of Debate in North Carolina” in Navigating Opportunity: Policy Debate in the 21st Century By Allan D. Louden, p311

The second major problem with the critique that identifies a naivety in articulating debate and democracy is that it presumes that the primary pedagogical outcome of debate is speech capacities. But the democratic capacities built by debate are not limited to speech—as indicated earlier, debate builds capacity for critical thinking, analysis of public claims, informed decision making, and better public judgment. If the picture of modem political life that underwrites this critique of debate is a pessimistic view of increasingly labyrinthine and bureaucratic administrative politics, rapid scientific and technological change outpacing the capacities of the citizenry to comprehend them, and ever-expanding insular special-interest- and money-driven politics, it is a puzzling solution, at best, to argue that these conditions warrant giving up on debate. If democracy is open to rearticulation, it is open to rearticulation precisely because as the challenges of modern political life proliferate, the citizenry's capacities can change, which is one of the primary reasons that theorists of democracy such as Ocwey in The Public awl Its Problems place such a high premium on education (Dewey 1988,63, 154). Debate provides an indispensible form of education in the modem articulation of democracy because it builds precisely the skills that allow the citizenry to research and be informed about policy decisions that impact them, to son rhroueh and evaluate the evidence for and relative merits of arguments for and against a policy in an increasingly infonnation-rich environment, and to prioritize their time and political energies toward policies that matter the most to them. The merits of debate as a tool for building democratic capacity-building take on a special significance in the context of information literacy. John Larkin (2005, HO) argues that one of the primary failings of modern colleges and universities is that they have not changed curriculum to match with the challenges of a new information environment. This is a problem for the course of academic study in our current context, but perhaps more important, argues Larkin, for the future of a citizenry that will need to make evaluative choices against an increasingly complex and multimediatcd information environment (ibid-). Larkin's study tested the benefits of debate participation on information-literacy skills and concluded that in-class debate participants reported significantly higher self-efficacy ratings of their ability to navigate academic search databases and to effectively search and use other Web resources: To analyze the self-report ratings of the instructional and control group students, we first conducted a multivariate analysis of variance on all of the ratings, looking jointly at the effect of instmction/no instruction and debate topic . . . that it did not matter which topic students had been assigned . . . students in the Instnictional [debate) group were significantly more confident in their ability to access information and less likely to feel that they needed help to do so----These findings clearly indicate greater self-efficacy for online searching among students who participated in (debate).... These results constitute strong support for the effectiveness of the project on students' self-efficacy for online searching in the academic databases. There was an unintended effect, however: After doing ... the project, instructional group students also felt more confident than the other students in their ability to get good information from Yahoo and Google. It may be that the library research experience increased self-efficacy for any searching, not just in academic databases. (Larkin 2005, 144) Larkin's study substantiates Thomas Worthcn and Gaylcn Pack's (1992, 3) claim that debate in the college classroom plays a critical role in fostering the kind of problem-solving skills demanded by the increasingly rich media and information environment of modernity. Though their essay was written in 1992 on the cusp of the eventual explosion of the Internet as a medium, Worthcn and Pack's framing of the issue was prescient: the primary question facing today's student has changed from how to best research a topic to the crucial question of learning how to best evaluate which arguments to cite and rely upon from an easily accessible and veritable cornucopia of materials. There are, without a doubt, a number of important criticisms of employing debate as a model for democratic deliberation. But cumulatively, the evidence presented here warrants strong support for expanding debate practice in the classroom as a technology for enhancing democratic deliberative capacities. The unique combination of critical thinking skills, research and information processing skills, oral communication skills, and capacities for listening and thoughtful, open engagement with hotly contested issues argues for debate as a crucial component of a rich and vital democratic life. In-class debate practice both aids students in achieving the best goals of college and university education, and serves as an unmatched practice for creating thoughtful, engaged, open-minded and self-critical students who are open to the possibilities of meaningful political engagement and new articulations of democratic life. Expanding this practice is crucial, if only because the more we produce citizens that can actively and effectively engage the political process, the more likely we are to produce revisions of democratic life that are necessary if democracy is not only to survive, but to thrive. Democracy faces a myriad of challenges, including: domestic and international issues of class, gender, and racial justice; wholesale environmental destruction and the potential for rapid climate change; emerging threats to international stability in the form of terrorism, intervention and new possibilities for great power conflict; and increasing challenges of rapid globalization including an increasingly volatile global economic structure. More than any specific policy or proposal, an informed and active citizenry that deliberates with greater skill and sensitivity provides one of the best hopes for responsive and effective democratic governance, and by extension, one of the last best hopes for dealing with the existential challenges to democracy [in an] increasingly complex world.

#### It’s the only portable skill

**Steinberg & Freeley 8** \*Austin J. Freeley is a Boston based attorney who focuses on criminal, personal injury and civil rights law, AND \*\*David L. Steinberg , Lecturer of Communication Studies @ U Miami, Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making pp9-10

After several days of intense debate, first the United States House of Representatives and then the U.S. Senate voted to authorize President George W. Bush to attack Iraq if Saddam Hussein refused to give up weapons of mass destruction as required by United Nations's resolutions. Debate about a possible military\* action against Iraq continued in various governmental bodies and in the public for six months, until President Bush ordered an attack on Baghdad, beginning Operation Iraqi Freedom, the military campaign against the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein. He did so despite the unwillingness of the U.N. Security Council to support the military action, and in the face of significant international opposition. Meanwhile, and perhaps equally difficult for the parties involved, a young couple deliberated over whether they should purchase a large home to accommodate their growing family or should sacrifice living space to reside in an area with better public schools; elsewhere a college sophomore reconsidered his major and a senior her choice of law school, graduate school, or a job. Each of these\* situations called for decisions to be made. Each decision maker worked hard to make well-reasoned decisions. Decision making is a thoughtful process of choosing among a variety of options for acting or thinking. It requires that the decider make a choice. Life demands decision making. We make countless individual decisions every day. To make some of those decisions, we work hard to employ care and consideration; others seem to just happen. Couples, families, groups of friends, and coworkers come together to make choices, and decision-making homes from committees to juries to the U.S. Congress and the United Nations make decisions that impact us all. Every profession requires effective and ethical decision making, as do our school, community, and social organizations. We all make many decisions even- day. To refinance or sell one's home, to buy a high-performance SUV or an economical hybrid car.what major to select, what to have for dinner, what candidate CO vote for. paper or plastic, all present lis with choices. Should the president deal with an international crisis through military invasion or diplomacy? How should the U.S. Congress act to address illegal immigration? Is the defendant guilty as accused? Tlie Daily Show or the ball game?And upon what information should I rely to make my decision? Certainly some of these decisions are more consequential than others. Which amendment to vote for, what television program to watch, what course to take, which phone plan to purchase, and which diet to pursue all present unique challenges. At our best, we seek out research and data to inform our decisions. Yet even the choice of which information to attend to requires decision making. In 2006, TIMI: magazine named YOU its "Person of the Year." Congratulations! Its selection was based on the participation not of ''great men" in the creation of history, but rather on the contributions of a community of anonymous participants in the evolution of information. Through blogs.online networking. You Tube. Facebook, MySpace, Wikipedia, and many other "wikis," knowledge and "truth" are created from the bottom up, bypassing the authoritarian control of newspeople. academics, and publishers. We have access to infinite quantities of information, but how do we sort through it and select the best information for our needs? The ability of every decision maker to make good, reasoned, and ethical decisions relies heavily upon their ability to think critically. Critical thinking enables one to break argumentation down to its component parts in order to evaluate its relative validity and strength. Critical thinkers are better users of information, as well as better advocates. Colleges and universities expect their students to develop their critical thinking skills and may require students to take designated courses to that end. The importance and value of such study is widely recognized. Much of the most significant communication of our lives is conducted in the form of debates. These may take place in intrapersonal communications, in which we weigh the pros and cons of an important decision in our own minds, or they may take place in interpersonal communications, in which we listen to arguments intended to influence our decision or participate in exchanges to influence the decisions of others. Our success or failure in life is largely determined by our ability to make wise decisions for ourselves and to influence the decisions of others in ways that are beneficial to us. Much of our significant, purposeful activity is concerned with making decisions. Whether to join a campus organization, go to graduate school, accept a job oiler, buy a car or house, move to another city, invest in a certain stock, or vote for Garcia—these are just a few of the thousands of decisions we may have to make. Often, intelligent self-interest or a sense of responsibility will require us to win the support of others. We may want a scholarship or a particular job for ourselves, a customer for out product, or a vote for our favored political candidate.

### FW: Limits—Livability 2NC

#### Empiricism is on our side—an experimental debate tournament with no topic discouraged participation and was generally terrible

**Preston 3**—Thomas Preston, Professor of communications at the University of Missouri-St. Louis[Summer 2003, “No-topic debating in Parliamentary Debate: Students and Critic Reactions,” http://cas.bethel.edu/dept/comm/npda/journal/vol9no5.pdf]

For the overall student data, each the mean of each item was slightly below 4.0, but mostly, the kurtosis figures were negative, and the standard deviations high, indicating a bipolar response to each question. The frequency tables bear out strong negative reactions, but a number of positive reactions which tended to be less strong. On the one hand, a substantial number of students and critics felt very strongly that the experience was negative, with the mode=l for each item on the survey; however, on others, a substantial number of respondents rated aspects of the experience at 4 and above. The educational value had the highest central tendencies (mean=3.65, median=4.0, and mode=1.0), whereas the question over whether the students liked the experience was the lowest (mean=3.19, median=3.0, mode=1.0). Although there was a weak positive pole to the responses, those who had NDT/CEDA experience strongly opposed the idea of a no-topic year of debating in those organizations (mean=2.77, median =1.00, mode=1.00). cont. Reduced to absurdity, the notion of no rules for a debate tournament would result in chaos, bringing up an infinite regress into whether or not chaos is a good thing! At least on the surface, the results of this particular study would seem to discourage repeating this experiment as conducted for the present study. A number of participants may not want to return to the tournament because of the confusion and perceived lack of educational value. However, an exact representation and t-tests between results could help not only assess the validity and reliability of the instrument, but whether attitudes and perceptions have changed toward no-topic debating. Therefore, whereas Option III may seem to be out of the questions, benefits can still be gained from it in terms of studying the evolution of parliamentary debate form.

### FW: A2 “Perm”

#### 2. Perm is impossible—their model transforms debate into discussion

**Speice 03** (Speice, Patrick, Wake Forest ,and Lyle, Jim, debate coach at Clarion, 2003, “Traditional Policy Debate: Now More Than Ever”, Debaters Research Guide, http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/SpeiceLyle2003htm.htm) FS

The structure of intercollegiate and high school debate builds on to this competitive framework. Judges not only answer a yes/no question regarding the resolution/plan, their decision generates a winner and a loser for the event. Judges assign winners, determine who does the better debating, and give speaker points and ranks to determine which teams are excelling more than others in advancing particular claims that provide an answer to the question asked by the resolution. And, the competitiveness of the activity extends across rounds as tournaments promote the better teams to elimination rounds and crown a champion. Participants at tournaments such as the Tournament of Champions and the National Debate Tournament are determined by evaluating competitive success across the entirety of the debate season. Debate, neither in an ultra-generic form nor the specific form that we participate in can be classified merely as discussion or dialogue. If it were decided that the promotion of education is of greater importance than preserving debate as a game, then the activity would begin to fall apart. Imagine that if instead of having two teams argue over competing viewpoints about a particular resolution/plan that debate instead asked debaters to simply inform the other participants of a different viewpoint regarding the plan. What would the activity look like then? Instead of hearing why the plan was good and bad, or why one policy alternative was better than another, we instead would hear why the plan is good, and why the plan reminded us of a story about one’s childhood. How would the judge evaluate such claims? If the desirability of the plan loses its importance and debate ceases to answer a yes/no question, what criteria should be used to resolve the “debate” (Smith, 2002)? While promoting intellectual development and enterprise are important components of the activity, the promotion of these values at the expense of the value of clash can only lead to the transformation of debate into discussion. § Marked 13:07 § In fact, it is not only that such a development spurs the loss of competitiveness, such a turn for the activity risks the loss of debate itself. Teams can begin to argue however they wish, and the “2 + 2 = 4” strategy becomes viable. What comes to matter then is word choice or performance. The result is a loss of depth of the education provided by the activity. Learning loses direction and begins to wander into the realm of acquiring random trivia. The entire purpose of having a policy resolution is rendered moot. Certainly one of the things most debaters enjoy about debate is that it really has no rules, however, if we decide to completely throw away “rules,” even as guiding principles, then the activity becomes something other than debate as an activity premised on fairness and competitive equity. Does any of this mean that there is no room for experimentation in the activity? Does any of this mean that there is no room for critical argumentation in debate, in policy debate? The answer to both questions is “No.” What this does suggest, however, is that before we adopt, and use, these newer debate practices we need to consider how these tools fit into the overall scheme of the activity and its goals.

### FW: A2 “State = Racist”

#### 1. The proper response to state racism is protective measures—only legal reform can embed bulwarks against historical injustice

**Delgado 98** (Richard, Jean N. Lindsley Professor of Law at the University of Colorado Law School, “Is American Law Inherently Racist”, Debate w/ Prof. Farber, Berkeley Law Scholarship Repository, http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1211&context=facpubs)

AUDIENCE: If we accept the premise that American law is inherently racist, what can be done about it? Where do we start? And related to that, how can an inherently racist law be made unracist, or are we just doomed to a perpetual battle to decrease the level of racism in our laws? PROFESSOR DELGADO: No. I don't think that it is a dispiriting or an overly pessimistic view, if one accepts the position-as I do, that American law is recurrently, inherently racist any more than, it is enervating to accept the proposition that the human body, let's say, is inherently frail. From which it follows then that one ought to take reasonable measures. One ought to wear safety belts, one ought to vaccinate children, and one does not simply give up from there cognition that something is inherently a difficulty or a problem. Vigilance is what is called for, not giving up. So no, I do not take the position that the inherent racism that seems to inflict our society requires any sort of surrender. Quite the contrary, it requires all of our efforts if we are to be the society that we can be and that we are in other respects. I will address this point later in my talk.

#### 2. The state is not inherently racist—many state structures exist that facilitate coexistence of different ethnic and racial groups. It is possible to improve the state.

**Dean 06** (Jodi, Professor of Political Science, Hobart and William Smith College, “Is the state racist by nature?”) http://jdeanicite.typepad.com/i\_cite/2006/03/is\_the\_state\_ra.html#more

I don't think so. Overall, I think Old reads the state as such as fascist--rooted in an racial identity that seeks to establish its (impossible) unity through the violent annihilation of difference. This isn't convincing to me because there are, in fact, multicultural states and constitutions that seek promote or preserve different ethnicities. And, I don't read all claims made in terms of the inhabitants of a state (of its citizenry or people) as necessarily racialized or racializing, though they can be. Yet, I have a number of more specific problems with Old's view. First, I don't think there is such a beast as the modern state. As I understand it, there have been different kinds of states. The fact that there are different states recognized within the UN, say, or part of the international arena, does not mean that the states are states in the same way; it does not mean that, the efforts of hegemons to the contrary, all states are based in nations; nor does it mean that all nations are totalities or even wanna-be totalities. This suggests, then, that there is not one form or nature of the state that even could be considered racist. Second, and consequently, it seems important here to consider differences among state forms and histories. China, for example, didn't take its structure from religious-race wars. Anti-colonial and anti-imperial struggle impacted the state forms that arose in their wake. Third, the ability to wage total war and annihilate other races doesn't seem to me to characterize the structure or goals of most states. If so, then we would find the vast majority to be failure as states. Now, maybe they are failures, but surely for other reasons. Contemporary international relations theorists Mark Laffey and Jutta Weldes (in their chapter to the book Empire's New Clothes) can help this discussion. Rejecting the all too limited Westphalian model of states, they point out that the sovereignty narrative is state-centric: Many social processes--such as the internationalization of capital or modernity--and relations--such as those of gender, class, race, or colonialism--transcend state boundaries in complex and significant ways. Indeed, reflection on the past three hundred or so years--since Westphalia--indicates that the dominant political form has in any case been the imperial state and empire rather than the sovereign state. Laffey and Weldes also take up the Eurocentricism of Westphalian sovereignty, rejecting the idea that the territorial state arose in Europe and was imposed on the rest of the world. Why? Because this model neglects the persistent and integral relations between Europe and the non-European world and their joint role in generating the characteristic social forms of modernity, including the state itself. As Fernando Coronil observes, for example: "Since the European conquest of the Americans, the West and its peripheries have been mutually constituted through processes of imperial transculturation and capital accumulation that continue, in different forms, in the present." They also observe the limitation of a state centered approach to analyzing state violence (a point relevant to Old's claim regarding total war) European states have used foreign military and security manpower. Recruiting local soldiers and police forces from within colonized territories was integral to imperial relations between Europe and non-Europe throughout the period marked by the so-called Westphalian sovereign state, as the British empire in India attests...the sovereignty narrative obscures the international constitution of state power, a routine practice in the history of imperial relations.

### FW: Topic Good—Race

#### Understanding institutional policy is key to reform of racial hierarchies

**Winant 2k** (Howard, Temple University “Race and Race Theory” Annual Review of Sociology, 2000, http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/winant/Race\_and\_Race\_Theory.html)

To summarize the racial formation approach: (1) It views the meaning of race and the content of racial identities as unstable and politically contested; (2) It understands racial formation as the intersection/conflict of racial "projects" that combine representational/discursive elements with structural/institutional ones; (3) It sees these intersections as iterative sequences of interpretations ("articulations") of the meaning of race that are open to many types of agency, from the individual to the organizational, from the local to the global. If we are to understand the changing significance of race at the end of the 20th century, we must develop a more effective theory of race. The racial formation perspective at least suggests some directions in which such a theory should be pursued. As in the past, racial theory today is shaped by the large-scale sociopolitical processes it is called upon to explain. Employing a racial formation perspective, it is possible to glimpse a pattern in present global racial dynamics. That pattern looks something like the following: in the period during and after WWII an enormous challenge was posed to established systems of rule by racially-defined social movements around the world. Although these movement challenges achieved some great gains and precipitated important reforms in state racial policy, neither the movements nor the reforms could be consolidated. At the end of the century the world as a whole, and various national societies as well, are far from overcoming the tenacious legacies of colonial rule, apartheid, and segregation. All still experience continuing confusion, anxiety, and contention about race. Yet the legacies of epochal struggles for freedom, democracy, and human rights persist as well. Despite the enormous vicissitudes that demarcate and distinguish national conditions, historical developments, roles in the international market, political tendencies, and cultural norms, racial differences often operate as they did in centuries past: as a way of restricting the political influence, not just of racially subordinated groups, but of all those at the bottom end of the system of social stratification. In the contemporary era, racial beliefs and practices have become far more contradictory and complex. The "old world racial order" has not disappeared, but it has been seriously disrupted and changed. The legacy of democratic, racially oriented movements, and anti-colonialist initiatives throughout the world's South, remains a force to be reckoned with. But the incorporative (or if one prefers this term, "hegemonic") effects of decades of reform-oriented state racial policies have had a profound effect as well: they have removed much of the motivation for sustained, anti-racist mobilization. In this unresolved situation, it is unlikely that attempts to address worldwide dilemmas of race and racism by ignoring or "transcending" these themes, for example by adopting so-called "colorblind" or "differentialist" policies, will have much effect. In the past the centrality of race deeply determined the economic, political, and cultural configuration of the modern world. Although recent decades have seen a tremendous efflorescence of movements for racial equality and justice, the legacies of centuries of racial oppression have not been overcome. Nor is a vision of racial justice fully worked out. Certainly the idea that such justice has already been largely achieved -- as seen in the "colorblind" paradigm in the US, the "non-racialist" rhetoric of the South African Freedom Charter, the Brazilian rhetoric of "racial democracy," or the emerging "racial differentialism" of the European Union -- remains problematic. Will race ever be "transcended"? Will the world ever "get beyond" race? Probably not. But the entire world still has a chance of overcoming the stratification, the hierarchy, the taken-for-granted injustice and inhumanity that so often accompanies the "race concept." Like religion or language, race can be accepted as part of the spectrum of the human condition, while it is simultaneously and categorically resisted as a means of stratifying national or global societies. Nothing is more essential in the effort to reinforce democratic commitments, not to mention global survival and prosperity, as we enter a new millennium.

### FW: Topic Good—War Powers 2NC

A limited topic over war powers authority is key to solving the harms of the 1AC – it allows for an engaged public that can expose the hypocrisy of the federal government – only focus on specific policy questions can actualize change by making it relevant to policy-makers – the aff is more likely to cause disengagement and moral quietude than actual change

**Mellor 13**

The Australian National University, ANU College of Asia and the Pacific, Department Of International Relations,
“Why policy relevance is a moral necessity: Just war theory, impact, and UAVs,” European University Institute, Paper Prepared for BISA Conference 2013, DOA: 8-14-13

**This** section of the paper **considers** more generally **the need for** just war **theorists to engage with policy debate** **about the use of force**, **as** **well as to engage with the** more **fundamental moral and philosophical principles** of the just war tradition. **It draws on** John **Kelsay’s** **conception of just war thinking as being a social practice**,35 **as well as on** Michael **Walzer’s understanding of the role of the social critic in society**.36 It argues that the just war tradition is a form of “practical discourse” which is concerned with questions of “how we should act.”37 Kelsay argues that: **[T]he criteria of jus ad bellum and jus in bello provide a framework for structured participation in a public conversation about the use of military force** . . . **citizens who choose to speak in just war terms express commitments** . . . [i**]n the process of giving and asking for** **reasons for going to war**, **those who argue** in just war terms **seek to influence policy** **by persuading others that their analysis provides a way to express and fulfil the desire that military actions be** both **wise and just.38** He also argues that “**good just war thinking involves continuous and complete deliberation**, in the sense that one attends to all the standard criteria at war’s inception, at its end, and **throughout the course of the conflict**.”39 **This** is important as it **highlights the need for** just war **scholars to engage** **with the ongoing operations in war and the specific policies that are involved**. **The question of** **whether a particular** war is just or unjust, and the question of whether a particular **weapon (like drones**) **can be used in accordance with the jus in bello criteria**, only **cover a part of the overall justice of the war**. **Without an engagement with the reality of war**, **in** **terms of the policies used** in waging it, **it is impossible to engage with the “moral reality of war,”40 in terms of being able to discuss it and judge it in moral terms** Kelsay’s description of just war thinking as a social practice is similar to Walzer’s more general description of social criticism. The just war theorist, **as a social critic, must be involved with his or her own society and its practices**. In the same way that the social critic’s distance from his or her society is measured in inches and not miles,41 the just war **theorist must be close to and must understand the language through which war is constituted, interpreted and reinterpreted**.**42 It is only by understanding the values and language that their own society purports to live by that the social critic can hold up a mirror to that society to** **demonstrate** its **hypocrisy** **and to show the gap that exists** between its practice and its values.43 **The tradition** itself **provides a set of** **values and principles and**, as argued by Cian O’Driscoll, **constitutes a “language of engagement**” **to spur participation in public and political debate**.44 This language is part of “our common heritage, the product of many centuries of arguing about war.”45 **These principles and this language provide the terms through which people understand and come to interpret war, not in a deterministic way but by providing the categories necessary for moral understanding and moral argument about the legitimate and illegitimate uses of force**.46 **By spurring and providing the basis for political engagement the just war tradition ensures that the acts that occur within war are considered according to just war criteria and allows policy-makers to be held to account on this basis. Engaging with the reality of war requires** recognising that war is, as Clausewitz stated, **a continuation of policy**. **War**, according to Clausewitz, **is subordinate to politics and to political choices and these political choices can, and must, be judged and critiqued**.47 **Engagement and political debate are morally necessary** **as the alternative is disengagement and moral quietude**, **which is a sacrifice of the obligations of citizenship**.48 **This engagement must bring** just war **theorists into contact with the policy makers** **and** **will require work that is** accessible and **relevant to policy makers**, **however this does not mean a sacrifice of critical distance or an abdication of truth in the face of power.** **By engaging in detail** **with the policies being pursued** and their concordance or otherwise with **the principles of the just war tradition the policy-makers will be forced to account for their decisions and justify them in just war language.** **In contrast to the view**, **suggested** by Kenneth **Anderson, that “the public cannot be made part of the debate**” **and that “[w]e are** necessarily **committed into the hands of our political leadership**”,49 it is incumbent upon just war theorists to ensure that the public are informed and are capable of holding their political leaders to account. **To accept the idea that the political leadership are stewards and that accountability will not benefit the public, on whose behalf action is undertaken, but will only benefit al Qaeda,50 is a grotesque act of intellectual irresponsibility**. As Walzer has argued, it is precisely because it is “our country” that we are “especially obligated to criticise its policies.”51 This paper has discussed the empirics of the policies of drone strikes in the ongoing conflict with those associate with al Qaeda. It has demonstrated that there are significant moral questions raised by the just war tradition regarding some aspects of these policies and it has argued that, thus far, just **war scholars have not paid sufficient attention or engaged in sufficient detail with the policy implications of drone use.** **As such it has been argued that it is necessary for just war theorists to engage more directly with these issues and to ensure that their work is policy relevant**, **not in a utilitarian sense of abdicating from speaking the truth in the face of power**, **but by forcing policy makers to justify** their **actions according to the principles of the just war tradition, principles which they invoke themselves in formulating policy.** **By highlighting hypocrisy and providing the tools and language** **for the interpretation of action**, **the just war tradition provides the basis for the public engagement and political activism that are necessary for democratic politics.52**