# CEDA Round 5 v San Antonio MP

## 1NC

### Off

#### WE HAVE A COUPLE OF LINKS TO THE METHOD AND PERFORMANCE OF THE 1AC:

#### 1st - Failure to foreground our own complicity - We must forefront our complicity in systems of dominations as the starting-point for building alliances – systems of oppression are inter-locking and reinforcing – our intersectional strategy is key to create more productive ways of interacting with one another outside heteropatriarchal white supremacy that produces an arbitrary system of permanent war and domination

Smith 9 (Andrea - intellectual, feminist, and anti-violence activist, Founder of INCITE - A National Activist Organization of radical feminists of color, "Heteropatriarchy and the Three Pillars of White Supremacy: Rethinking Women of Color Organizing," http://www.iamsocialjustice.com/images/Color\_of\_Violence.pdf)

This framework has proven to be limited for women of color and people of color organizing. First, it tends to presume that our communities have been impacted by white supremacy in the same way. Consequently, we often assume that all of our communities will share similar strategies for liberation. In fact, however, our strategies often run into conflict. For example, one strategy that many people in US-born communities of color adopt, in order to advance economically out of impoverished communities, is to join the military. We then become complicit in oppressing and colonizing communities from other countries. Meanwhile, people from other countries often adopt the strategy of moving to the United States to advance economically, without considering their complicity in settling on the lands of indigenous peoples that are being colonized by the United States. Consequently, it may be more helpful to adopt an alternative framework for women of color and people of color organizing. I call one such framework the "Three Pillars of White Supremacy." This framework does not assume that racism and white supremacy is enacted in a singular fashion; rather, white supremacy is constituted by separate and distinct, but still interrelated, logics. Envision three pillars, one labeled Slavery/Capitalism, another labeled Genocide/Capitalism, and the last one labeled Orientalism/War, as well as arrows connecting each of the together. Slavery/Capitalism One pillar of white supremacy is the logic of slavery. As Sora Han, Jared Sexton, and Angela P. Harris note, this logic renders Black people as inherently slave- able-as nothing more than property.' That is, in this logic of white supremacy, Blackness becomes equated with slaveability. The forms of slavery may change- whether it is through the formal system of slavery, sharecropping, or through the current prison-industrial complex-but the logic itself has remained consistent. This logic is the anchor of capitalism, that is, the capitalist system ultimately commodifies all workers-one's own person becomes a commodity that one must sell in the labor market while the profits of one's work are taken by someone else. To keep this capitalist system in place-which ultimately commodifies most people-the logic of slavery applies a racial hierarchy to this system. This racial hierarchy tells people that as long as you are not Black, you have the opportunity to escape the commodification of capitalism. This helps people who are not Black to ' accept their lot in life, because they can feel that at least they are not at the very bottom of the racial hierarchy-at least they are nor property; at least they are not slaveable. The logic of slavery can be seen clearly in the current prison industrial complex (PIC). While the PIC generally incarcerates communities of color, it seems to be structured primarily on an anti-Black racism. That is, prior to the Civil War, most people in prison where white. However, after the thirteenth amendment was passed-which banned slavery, except for those in prison-Black people previously enslaved through the slavery system were reenslaved through the prison system. Black people who had been the property of slave owners became state property, through the conflict leasing system. Thus, we can actually look at the criminalization of Blackness as a logical extension of Blackness as property. Genocide/Colonialism A second pillar of white supremacy is the logic of genocide. This logic holds that indigenous peoples must disappear. In fact, they must always be disappearing, in order to allow non-indigenous peoples rightful claim over this land. Through this logic of genocide, non-Native peoples then become the rightful inheritors of all that was indigenous-land, resources, indigenous spirituality, or culture. As Kate Shanley notes, Native peoples are a permanent "present absence" in the US colonial imagination, an "absence" that reinforces, at every turn, the conviction that Native peoples are indeed vanishing and that the conquest of Native lands is justified. Ella Shoat and Robert Stam describe this absence as "an ambivalently repressive mechanism [which] dispels the anxiety in the face of the Indian, whose very presence is a reminder of the initially precarious grounding of the American nation-state itself.. .. In a temporal paradox, living Indians were induced to 'play dead,' as it were, in order to perform a narrative of manifest destiny in which their role, ultimately, was to dissappear." Rayna Green further elaborates that the current Indian "wannabe" phenomenon is based on a logic of genocide: non-Native peoples imagine themselves as the rightful inheritors of all that previously belonged to "vanished" Indians, thus entitling them to ownership of this land. "The living performance of 'playing Indian' by non-Indian peoples depends upon the physical and psychological removal, even the death, of real Indians. In that sense, the performance, purportedly often done out of a stated and implicit love for Indians, is really the obverse of another well- known cultural phenomenon, 'Indian hating,' as most often expressed in another, deadly performance genre called 'genocide."'~ After all, why would non-Native peoples need to play Indian- which often includes acts of spiritual appropriation and land theft-if they thought Indians were still alive and perfectly capable of being Indian themselves? The pillar of genocide serves as the anchor for colonialism-it is what allows non-Native peoples to feel they can rightfully own indigenous peoples' land. It is okay to take land from indigenous peoples, because indigenous peoples have disappeared. Orientalism/War A third pillar of white supremacy is the logic of Orientalism. Orient; s defined by Edward Said as the process of the West defining itself as a superior civilization by constructing itself in opposition to an "exotic" but inferior "Orient." (Here I am using the term "Orientalism" more broadly than to solely signify what has been historically named as the Orient or Asia.) The logic of Orientalism marks certain peoples or nations as inferior and as posing a constant threat to the well-being of empire. These peoples are still seen as "civilizations"-they are not property or "disappeared"-however, they will always be imaged as permanent foreign threats to empire. This logic is evident in the anti-immigration movements within the United States that target immigrants of color. It does not matter holy long immigrants of color reside in the United States, they generally become targeted as foreign threats, particularly during war time. Consequently, orientalism serves as the anchor for war, because it allows the United States to justify being in a constant state of war to protect itself from its enemies. For example, the United States feels entitled to use Orientalist logic to justify racial profiling of Arab Americans so that it can be strong enough to fight the "war on terror." Orientalism also allows the United States to defend the logics of slavery and genocide, as these practices enable the United States to stay "strong enough" to fight these constant wars. What becomes clear then is what Sora Han states- the United States is not at war; the United States is war.4 For the system of white supremacy to stay in place, the United States must always be at war. Because we are situated within different logics of white supremacy, we may misunderstand a racial dynamic if we simplistically try to explain one logic of white supremacy with another logic. For instance, think about the first scenario that opens this essay: if we simply dismiss Latinos or Arab peoples as "white," we fail to understand how a racial logic of Orientalism is in operation. That is, Latinos and Arabs are often situated in a racial hierarchy that privileges them over Black people. However, while Orientalist logic may bestow them some racial privilege, they are still cast as inferior yet threatening "civilizations" in the United States. Their privilege is not a signal that they will be assimilated, but that they will be marked as perpetual foreign threats to the US world order. Organizing Implications Under the old but still potent and dominant model, people of color organizing was based on the notion of organizing around shared victimhood. In this model, how- ever, we see that we are victims of white supremacy, but complicit in it as well. Our survival strategies and resistance to white supremacy are set by the system of white supremacy itself. What keeps us trapped within our particular pillars of white supremacy is that we are seduced with the prospect of being able to participate in the other pillars. For example, all non-Native peoples are promised the ability to join in the colonial project of settling indigenous lands. All non-Black peoples are promised that if they comply, they will not be at the bottom of the racial hierarchy. And Black, Native, Latino, and Asian peoples are promised that they will economically and politically advance if they join US wars to spread "democracy." Thus, people of color organizing must be premised on making strategic alliances with each other, based on where we are situated within the larger political economy. Thus, for example, Native peoples who are organizing against the colonial and genocidal practices committed by the US government will be more effective in their struggle if they also organize against US militarism, particularly the military recruitment of indigenous peoples to support US imperial wars. If we try to end US colonial practices at home, but support US empire by joining the military, we are strengthening the state's ability to carry out genocidal policies against people of color here and all over the world. This way, our alliances would not be solely based on shared victimization, but where we are complicit in the victimization of others. These approaches might help us to develop resistance strategies that do not inadvertently keep the system in place for all of us, and keep all of us accountable. In all of these cases, **we would check our aspirations** against the aspirations of other communities to ensure that our model of liberation does not become the model of oppression for others. These practices require us to be more vigilant in how we may have internalized some of these logics in our own organizing practice. For instance, much racial justice organizing within the United States has rested on a civil rights framework that fights for equality under the law. An assumption behind this organizing is that the United States is a democracy with some flaws, but is otherwise admirable. Despite the fact that it rendered slaves three-fifths of a person, the US Constitution is presented as the model document from which to build a flourishing democracy. However, as Luana Ross notes, it has never been against US law to commit genocide against indigenous peoples-in fact, genocide is the law of the country. [The United States could not exist without it. In the United States, democracy is actually the alibi for genocide-it is the practice that covers up United States colonial control over indigenous lands. Our organizing can also reflect anti-Black racism. Recently, with the out- growth of "multiculturalism" there have been calls to "go beyond the black/white binary" and include other communities of color in our analysis, as presented in the third scenario. There are a number of flaws with this analysis. First, it replaces an analysis of white supremacy with a politics of multicultural representation; if we just include more people, then our practice will be less racist. Not true. This model does not address the nuanced structure of white supremacy, such as through these distinct logics of slavery, genocide, and Orientalism. Second, it obscures the centrality of the slavery logic in the system of white supremacy, which is based on a black/white binary. The black/white binary is not the only binary which characterizes white supremacy, but it is still a central one that we cannot "go beyond" in our racial justice organizing efforts. If we do not look at how the logic of slaveability inflects our society and our thinking, it will be evident in our work as well. For example, other communities of color often appropriate the cultural work and organizing strategies of African American civil rights or Black Power movements without corresponding assumptions that we should also be in solidarity with Black communities. We assume that this work is the common "property of all oppressed groups, and we can appropriate it without being accountable. Angela P. Harris and Juan Perea debate the usefulness of the black/white binary in the book, Critical Race Theory. Perea complains that the black/white binary fails to include the experiences of other people of color. However, he fails to identify alternative racializing logics to the black/white paradigm. Meanwhile, Angela P. Harris argues that "the story of 'race' itself is that of the construction of Blackness and whiteness. In this story, Indians, Asian Americans, and Latinos do exist. But their roles are subsidiary to the fundamental binary national drama. As a political claim, Black exceptionalism exposes the deep mistrust and tensions among American ethnic groups racialized as nonwhite."~ Let's examine these statements in conversation with each other. Simply saying we need to move beyond the black/white binary (or perhaps, the "black/non- black" binary) in US racism obfuscates the racializing logic of slavery, and prevents us from seeing that this binary constitutes Blackness as the bottom of a color hierarchy. However, this is not the only binary that fundamentally constitutes white supremacy. There is also an indigenous/settler binary, where Native genocide is central to the logic of white supremacy and other non-indigenous people of color also form "a subsidiary" role. We also face another Orientalist logic that fundamentally constitutes Asians, Arabs, and Latinos as foreign threats, requiring the United States to be at permanent war with these peoples. In this construction, Black and Narive peoples play subsidiary roles. Clearly the black/white binary is central to racial and political thought and practice in the United States, and any understanding of white supremacy must take it into consideration. However, if we look at only this binary, we may misread the dynamics of white supremacy in different contexts. For example, critical race theorist Cheryl Harris's analysis of whiteness as property reveals this weakness. In Critical Race Theory, Harris contends that whites have a property interest in the preservation of whiteness, and seek to deprive those who are "tainted" by Black or Indian blood from these same white property interests. Harris simply assumes that the positions of African Americans and American Indians are the same, failing to consider US policies of forced assimilation and forced whiteness on American Indians. These policies have become so entrenched that when Native peoples make political claims, they have been accused of being white. When Andrew Jackson removed the Cherokee along the Trail of Tears, he argued that those who did not want removal were really white.7 In contemporary times, when I was a non-violent witness for the Chippewa spearfishers in the late 1980s, one of the more frequent slurs whites hurled when the Chippewa attempted to exercise their treaty-protected right to fish was that they had white parents, or they were really white. Status differences between Blacks and Natives are informed by the different economic positions African Americans and American Indians have in US society. & African Americans have been traditionally valued for their labor, hence it is in the interest of the dominant society to have as many people marked "Black," as possible, thereby maintaining a cheap labor pool; by contrast, American Indians have been valued for the land base they occupy, so it is in the interest of dominant society to have as few people marked "Indian" as possible, facilitating access to Native lands. "Whiteness" operates differently under a logic of genocide than it does from logic of slavery. Another failure of US-based people of color in organizing is that we often fall back on a "US-centricism," believing that what is happening "over there" is less important than what is happening here. We fail to see how the United States maintains the system of oppression here precisely by tying our allegiances to the interests of US empire "over there." Heteropatriarchy and White Supremacy Heteropatriarchy is the building block of US empire. In fact, it is the building block of the nation-state form of governance. Christian Right authors make these links in their analysis of imperialism and empire. For example, Christian Right activist and founder of Prison Fellowship Charles Colson makes the connection between homosexuality and the nation-state in his analysis of the war on terror, explaining that one of the causes of terrorism is same-sex marriage: Marriage is the traditional building block of human society, intended both to unite couples and bring children into the world . . . There is a natural moral order for the family . . . the family, led by a married mother and father, is the best available structure for both child- rearing and cultural health. Marriage is not a private institution designed solely for the individual gratification of its participants. If we fail to enact a Federal Marriage Amendment, we can expect not just more family breakdown, but also more criminals behind bars and more chaos in our streets." Colson is linking the well-being of US empire to the well-being of the heteropatriarchal family. He continues: When radical Islamists see American women abusing Muslim men, as they did in the Abu Ghraib prison, and when they see news coverage of same-sex couples being "married" in US towns, we make this kind of freedom abhorrent-the kind they see as a blot on Allah's creation. We must preserve traditional marriage in order to protect the United States from those who would use our depravity to destroy us? As Ann Burlein argues in Lift High the Cross, it may be a mistake to argue that the goal of Christian Right politics is to create a theocracy in the United States. Rather, Christian Right politics work through the private family (which is coded as white, patriarchal, and middle class) to create a "Christian America." She notes that the investment in the private family makes it difficult for people to invest in more public forms of social connection. In addition, investment in the suburban private family serves to mask the public disinvestment in urban areas that makes the suburban lifestyle possible. The social decay in urban areas that results from this disinvestment is then construed as the result of deviance from the Christian family ideal rather than as the result of political and economic forces. As former head of the Christian Coalition, Ralph Reed, states: "'The only true solution to crime is to restore the family,"10 and "Family break-up causes poverty."" Concludes Burlein, "'The family' is no mere metaphor but a crucial technology by which modern power is produced and exercised."'\* As I have argued elsewhere, in order to colonize peoples whose societies are nor based on social hierarchy, colonizers must first naturalize hierarchy through instituting patriarchy.13 In turn, patriarchy rests on a gender binary system in which only two genders exist, one dominating the other. Consequently, Charles Colson is correct when he says that the colonial world order depends on heteronormativity. Just as the patriarchs rule the family, the elites of the nation-state rule their citizens. Any liberation struggle that does not challenge heteronormativity cannot substantially challenge colonialism or white supremacy. Rather, as Cathy Cohen contends, such struggles will maintain colonialism based on a politics of secondary marginalization where the most elite class of these groups will further their aspirations on the backs of those most marginalized within the community. Through this process of secondary marginalization, the national or racial justice struggle takes on either implicitly or explicitly a nation-state model as the end point of its struggle-a model of governance in which the elites govern the rest through violence and domination, as well as exclude those who are not members of "the nation." Thus, national liberation politics become less vulnerable to being coopted by the Right when we base them on a model of liberation that fundamentally challenges right-wing conceptions of nation. We need a model based on community relationships and on mutual respect.

#### 2Nd Their faith in PUBLIC SPACES – The 1ac believes that we can just put their affirmative out in the PUBLIC as an attempt to affirm their illegality The public sphere is not neutral. Its parameters are defined by the dictates of power. This results in the exclusion of marginalized groups as well as devaluation and psychic violence whenever actual access is gained

**Sparks 3**

“Queens, Teens, and Model Mothers

Race, Gender, and the Discourse of Welfare Reform” Race and the Politics of Welfare Reform Sanford F. Schram, Joe Soss, and Richard C. Fording, Editors http://www.press.umich.edu/titleDetailDesc.do?id=11932 The University of Michigan Press, 2003

Iris Young, for example, has identified two forms of exclusion that prevent citizens from fully participating in democracies. What she calls external exclusion “names the many ways that individuals and groups that ought to be included are purposely or inadvertently left out of fora for discussion and decision-making” (2000, 53–54). External exclusion can be as blatant as deliberately failing to invite certain groups to impor- tant meetings, or can take more subtle forms such as the way economic inequalities affect access to political institutions. As Nancy Fraser has noted, in societies like the United States in which the publication and cir- culation of political views depends on media organizations that are pri- vately owned and operated for pro‹t, those citizens who lack wealth will also generally “lack access to the material means of equal participation” (1997, 79). This criticism has obvious salience for families living on wel- fare budgets. On a more basic level, money and time are also necessary for participation in putatively “free” political institutions. Poor parents with young children, for example, might not have the resources to pur- chase child-care in order to attend a town council meeting at which important political decisions are made.3 Internal exclusions, in contrast, “concern ways that people lack effective opportunity to influence the thinking of others even when they have access to fora and procedures of decision-making” (Young 2000, 55; emphasis added). Citizens may find that “others ignore or dismiss or patronize their statements and expressions. Though formally included in a forum or process, people may find that their claims are not taken seriously and may believe that they are not treated with equal respect” (55). Internal exclusion can take the form of public ridicule or face-to-face inattention (Bickford 1996), but it can also stem from less obvious sources, such as the norms of articulateness, dispassionateness, and orderliness that are often privileged in political discussions (Young 2000, 56). As Young observes, In many formal situations the better-educated white middle-class people . . . often act as though they have a right to speak and that their words carry authority, whereas those of other groups often feel intimidated by the argument requirements and the formality and rules of parliamentary procedure, so they do not speak, or speak only in a way that those in charge ‹nd “disruptive.” . . . The dominant groups, moreover, often fail entirely to notice this devaluation and silencing, while the less privileged often feel put down or frustrated, either losing confidence in themselves or becoming angry. (1996, 124) Since “unruly” forms of speech tend to be used primarily by women, racial minorities, and working-class people, large groups of citizens face the devaluation of their political participation.

#### 3rd – accessibility – Mestiza consciousness and the border of identity is not accessible to all. It assumes a form of identity that combines the colonized and the colonizer, which means the native voice is denied the potential to engage in your politics in a meaningful way. Proves that your coalition doesn’t open up space for all ontological subjects that identify as immigrants to be participants within the system. Under this form of intersectional politics the aff replicates systems of power that exclude certain voices. We need to be able to confront the oppressor within us or at least understand the capacity for us to commit violence against the other.

The fluidity of Mestizaje identity glosses over natives who can’t escape identity – Notions of fluid identity ALWAYS work to destroy Native culture, sanitizing genocide and assimilation while preserving abuse in the realm of materiality

Grande 4 Sandy, Associate Professor of Education at Connecticut College, Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought, p 112-113

Whether it is land, spiritual practice, or genetic material that is being mined, appropriated, and sold, the logic of domination remains the same —in the eyes of U.S. law and policy the collective rights and concerns of indige- nous peoples are considered subordinate to individual rights. Thus, the ex- tension of marketplace logic to the realms of cultural and intellectual property not only extends the power of the whitestream but also diminishes the power of indigenous communities, continuing the project of cultural imperialism that began over five hundred years ago. In view of the above, it is clear to see how postmodernism — the notion of fluid boundaries, the relativizing of difference and negation of grand narra-tives—primarily serves whitestream America. The multiphrenia of postmod- ern plurality, its "world of simulation" and obliteration of any sense of ob- jective reality, has given rise to a frenetic search for the "authentic" led by culture vultures and capitalist bandits fraught with "imperialist nostalgia."-5 In response. American Indian communities have restricted access to the dis- cursive spaces of American Indian culture and identity and the nondiscursive borders of American Indian communities. In short, the notion of fluidity has never worked to the advantage of indigenous peoples. Federal agencies have invoked the language of fluid or unstable identities as the rationale for dis- mantling the structures of tribal life. Whitestream America has seized upon the message of relativism to declare open season on Indians, and whitestream academics have employed the language of signification and simulation to transmute centuries of war between indigenous peoples and their respective nation-states into a "genetic and cultural dialogue" (Valle and Torres 1995, 141). Thus, in spite of its "democratic" promise, postmodernism and its ludic theories of identity fail to provide indigenous communities the theoretical grounding for asserting their claims as colonized peoples, and. more impor- tant, impede construction of transcendent emancipatory theories.

5th – Big Business Border Grabs – The notion of the “borderless” is the voice of big business—it is a phantasmal symbol turning freedom into a conduit for capital transfer – aff gets coopted by corporate evil.

DeFazio, professor @ the English Department at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, 02

Kimberly, May/June, Red Critique, “Whither Borders?”, http://www.redcritique.org/MayJune02/whitherborders.htm, accessed 7-19-13, GSK

Until recently the leaders of big business couldn't boast enough about the new "borderless" economy—a post-national world of global prosperity in which capital, labor, goods and services circulate freely—and its limitless opportunities for travel, commerce, and communication. So borderless was this new world, these triumphalist narratives suggested, that like all identities the border between rich and poor worldwide was being blurred in a continuum of boundless consumption. As corporate consultant Kenichi Ohmae has argued, "as the 21st century approaches and as what I call the four 'I's'—industry, investment, individuals, and information—flow relatively unimpeded across national borders, the building-block concepts appropriate to a 19th-century, closed-country model of the world no longer hold" (The End of the Nation State vii). Borderlessness had become a code for the new global freedom. Yet with the emergence of the so-called war on terror, the borders have "returned" to the borderless economy, and "freedom" is being redefined. It appears that the Bush Administration is concerned with nothing other than securing US borders, tightening controls and channeling billions of dollars of public funds to new and already existing national security, police and intelligence departments. The borders, it seems, had become too "permeable". Suddenly we are told that the US borders are dangerously insecure, and the preservation of American freedom now lies in the suspension of virtually all democratic rights, including far-reaching new surveillance technologies to police all borders of the US, as a means of distinguishing "safe" immigrants from "dangerous" ones, "us" from "them", the "civilized" from the "barbarians". Immigrants are under attack not only in the US, but throughout Europe (or "Fortress Europe", as it has become known), where a number of far-right politicians have come to prominence on anti-immigrant policies, pulling with them to the right "new social democrats" such as Tony Blair. And in one of the most violent manifestations of bordering, Israel has begun constructing a physical barrier further imprisoning Palestinians behind a 12 mile long security fence, separating "peace-loving" Israelis from, as Israeli government official Effi Eitam put it recently, Palestinian "animals". The borderlessness of the new economy now appears as what it always was: a deadly farce, with freedom another name for the free market. For, it is not only the recent corporate scandals that have exposed the great economic crisis now shaking the foundations of society worldwide, but the actual decline of the living and working conditions of the vast majority of the world's people, more and more of whom are forced to live under increasingly desperate situations of poverty, hunger, illness, illiteracy and rampant destruction caused by imperialist wars—while a tiny global ruling elite accumulates ever more wealth and control over world resources. The borderless world, in short, was never without borders. It was always founded on the border of exploitation; that is, the relation between the propertyless and the property owners. Those who have only their labor to sell because they do not own the means of production on one side, and on the other those who own the means of production and therefore compel all who do not to work for them, in exchange for wages which represent only a fraction of the value actually produced. The "return" of the border since September 11 represents the exacerbation of the antagonism between labor and capital: an antagonism which exceeds all national borders. This relation between workers and owners is the fundamental "border" hidden beneath the euphoric rhetoric of borderlessness—a rhetoric that has found expression in the last decade not only in the managerial philosophy of corporate gurus and the third-way policies of US and European state officials, but in the high-theory idiom of postmodern "hybridity" and the more popular discourse of the Internet.

#### Our alternative is a process of Intralocality is the process of being self-critical within an intersectional framework – the 1AC reinscibes distancing as a means of protecting one’s privilege – it’s a sequencing question – we must evaluate ourselves in relation to our social locations in the debate community as a starting-point for effective debate to occur

Moore 11 (Darnell L., writer and activist whose work is informed by anti-racist, feminist, queer of color, and anti-colonial thought and advocacy. Darnell's essays, social commentary, poetry, and interviews have appeared in various national and international media venues, including the Feminist Wire, Ebony magazine, and The Huffington Post, "On Location: The “I” in the Intersection," http://thefeministwire.com/2011/12/on-location-the-i-in-the-intersection/)

The most general statement of our politics at the present time would be that we are actively committed to struggling against racial, sexual, heterosexual, and class oppression and see as our particular ask the development of integrated analysis and practice based upon the fact that the major systems of oppression are interlocking. The synthesis of these oppressions creates the conditions of our lives. As black women we see black feminism as the logical political movement to combat the manifold and simultaneous oppressions that all women of color face. -The Combahee River Collective in A Black Feminist Statement¶ Many radical movement builders are well-versed in the theory of intersectionality. Feminists, queer theorists and activists, critical race scholars, progressive activists, and the like owe much to our Black feminist sisters, like The Combahee River Collective, who introduced us to the reality of simultaneity–as a framework for assessing the multitude of interlocking oppressions that impact the lives of women of color–in A Black Feminist Statement (1978). Their voices and politics presaged Kimberlé Crenshaw’s very useful theoretical contribution of “intersectionality” to the feminist toolkit of political interventions in 1989.¶ Since its inception, many have referenced the term—sometimes without attribution to the black feminist intellectual [genealogy](http://thefeministwire.com/2011/12/on-location-the-i-in-the-intersection/) from which it emerged—as a form of en vogue progressive parlance. In fact, it seems to be the case that it is often referenced in progressive circles as a counterfeit license (as in, “I understand the ways that race, sexuality, class, and gender coalesce. I get it. I really do.”) to enter resistance work even if the person who declares to have a deep “understanding” of the connectedness of systemic matrices of oppression, themselves, have yet to discern and address their own complicity in the maintenance of the very oppressions they seek to name and demolish. I am certain that I am not the only person who has heard a person use language embedded with race, class, gender, or ability privilege follow-up with a reference to “intersectionality.”¶ My concern, then, has everything to do with the way that the fashioning of intersectionality as a political framework can lead toward the good work of analyzing ideological and material systems of oppression—as they function “out there”—and away from the great work of critical analyses of the ways in which we, ourselves, can function as actants in the narratives of counter-resistance that we rehearse. In other words, we might be missing the opportunity to read our complicities, our privileges, our accesses, our excesses, our excuses, our modes of oppressing—located “in here”—as they occupy each of us.¶ Crenshaw’s theorization has provided us with a useful lens to assess the problematics of the interrelated, interlocking apparatuses of power and privilege and their resulting epiphenomena of powerlessness and subjugation. Many have focused on the external dimensions of oppression and their material results manifested in the lives of the marginalized, but might our times be asking of us to deeply consider our own “stuff” that might instigate such oppressions?¶ What if we extended Crenshaw’s theory of intersectionality by invoking what we might name “intralocality”? Borrowing from sociologists, the term “social location,” which broadly speaks to one’s context, highlights one’s standpoint(s)—the social spaces where s/he is positioned (i.e. race, class, gender, geographical, etc.). Intralocality, then, is concerned with the social locations that foreground our knowing and experiencing of our world and our relationships to the systems and people within our world. Intralocality is a call to theorize the self in relation to power and privilege, powerlessness and subjugation. It is work that requires the locating of the “I” in the intersection. And while it could be argued that such work is highly individualistic, I contend that it is at the very level of self-in-relation-to-community where communal transformation is made possible.¶ Might it be time to travel into the deep of our contexts? Might it be time for us—theorists/activists—to do the work of intersectionality (macro/system-analysis) in concert with the intra-local (micro/self-focused analysis)?¶ Intersectionality as an analysis, rightly, asks of us to examine systemic oppressions, but in these times of radical and spontaneous insurgencies—times when we should reflect on our need to unoccupy those sites of privilege (where they exist) in our own lives even as we occupy some other sites of domination—work must be done at the level of the self-in-community. We cannot—as a progressive community—rally around notions of “progression” and, yet, be complicit in the very homo/transphobias, racisms, sexisms, ableisms, etc. that violently terrorize the lives of so many others. If a more loving and just community is to be imagined and advanced, it seems to me that we would need to start at a different location than we might’ve expected: self.

## 2NC

### Link – single axis

#### Single-axis identity politics fractures political coalitions – failure to account for the ways in which YOU could be an oppressor means that the delicate fabric of coalitions will be more readily shredded – intersectionality is key to overcoming conflicts and reconciling splits in political struggles to develop a TRUE liberation strategy

Chun et. al 13 (Jennifer Jihye - Department of Sociology @ the U of Toronto Scarborough, George Lipsitz - Department of Sociology and Department of Black Studies @ UC Santa Barbara, Young Shin - Asian Immigrant Women Advocates, "Intersectionality as a Social Movement StrategyL Asian Immigrant Women Advocates," Signs, Vol. 38 No. 4, Intersectionality: Theorizing Power, Empowering Theory, (Summer 2013), pp. 917-940)

In both academics and activism, the concept of intersectionality can be used to clear up the confusions about sameness and difference that dominant ways of knowing both permit and promote. It can be a tool for refining understanding of the relationships that link individuals to social groups. No individual lives every aspect of his or her existence within a single identity category. Every person is a crowd, characterized by multiple identities, identifications, and allegiances. Yet the process of racial formation set in motion by dominant racial projects brings individuals together in particular groups with shared and linked fates ð Omi and Winant 1994 Þ . Collective political struggle requires the creation of strategic group positions adaptable to forging coalitions within and across identity groups. These positions are always partial, perspectival, and performative. They never encompass all dimensions of people’s identities. Yet as an analytic tool intersectionality can be used strategically to take inventory of differences, to identify potential contradictions and conflicts, and to recognize split and conflicting identities not as obstacles to solidarity but as valuable evidence about problems unsolved and as new coalitions that need to be formed. Group identities are vital for collective mobilizations for rights, resources, and recognition, yet every collective identity expressed through solidarities of sameness runs the risk of occluding differences within the group. In its most sophisticated articulations, intersectionality acknowledges both the plurality and diversity of identities that comprise any group and the common concerns that create aggregate identities. In Crenshaw’s deft formulation, the utility of intersectionality flows from its ability to mediate “the tension between assertions of multiple identity and the ongoing necessity of group politics” ð 1991, 1296 Þ . Without intersectionality, group unity threatens to degenerate into a compulsory uniformity that benefits some members of the group at the expense of others. For example, employment opportunities and promotions for Black workers do not necessarily provide justice for Black women. Anti- racist organizing can be uncritical about misogyny. Homophobia can seep into feminist and antiracist mobilizations alike, while race and class privilege can be unexamined within queer politics. Still, Crenshaw does not advocate the abandonment of identity categories and the embrace of a disembodied universalism. Instead, she recognizes that identities can contain situated knowledges with valuable vantage points on power. In the tradition of Aime ́ Cesaire, she rejects both parochial particularism and disembodied universalism. Instead, she argues for a “universal” that is contingent, provisional, and rich with particulars, that entails the dialogue of all, the autonomy of each, and the dictatorship of none ð Cesaire 2000, 25 – 26 Þ . Crenshaw’s intersectionality promotes struggles that are race-based but not race-bound, feminist but not essentialist, always pro-Black and pro-woman but never only pro-Black and pro-woman. Seeking unity without uniformity, mobilizing identities without demanding that people be identical, intersectionality matters from Crenshaw’s perspective because it is an indispensible tool for creating new democratic institutions, identities, and practices.

### Link – Accessibility

#### Undoing privilege is about process-over-product – we must be self-reflexive as a means of destabilizing our privileged modes of viewing the world – this internally link turns their form of debate because privilege warps and distorts our interactions with others

Yancy 8 (George, Prof of Philosophy at Duquesne University, *Black bodies, white gazes : the continuing significance of race*, p. 246-247)

I conceptualize existential conversion in relation to whiteness as a constant affirmation of new forms of responsiveness, new forms of challenging unearned privileges, and assiduous attempts at founding antiwhiteness values. After all, one has to live in the everyday world in which whiteness--despite one's commitment to live one's body in freedom, that is, contrary to the expectations and ready-made meanings that always already exist in the serious world of whiteness-continues to be seductive. To "live one's body in freedom" therefore does not mean that one lives one's body outside various situational constraints and historical forces, but that one continues to achieve those self- reflexive moments that attempt to **destabilize** **various habituated** white normative practices. Hence **existential conversion**, at least with respect to whiteness, must involve a self-reflexive way of being-in-the-world where the newcomer continually takes up the project of disaffiliation from whitely ways of being, even as she undergoes processes of interpellation. My point here is that as she lives her body in freedom, as she challenges the white racialized and racist world, its discourses and power relations, as she attempts to forge new habits and new forms of self-knowledge, she does not live her body outside of history. There is no nonracial Archimedean point from which she can unsettle racism. Hence, while a process of constant destabilization that cracks away at whiteness is indispensable as a value and a form of praxis, there is the realization that "a cartography of race would better describe a white race traitor as 'off center,' that is, as destabilizing the center while still remaining in it.,,67 So, even as the newcomer conceivably extends her hand across the color-line, reaching out to the young W. E. B. Du Bois, thus throwing her whiteness off center and situates herself in that space of liminality, she will, at some point, leave the classroom and be thrown back into the serious world of whiteness where the rich possibilities of ambush are covered over. Concerning the insidious forms of whitely modes of being, Bailey's distinction between privilege-cognizant and privilege-evasive white scripts proves helpful. Within the framework of this discourse, the newcomer must constantly reaffirm her commitment to enacting a privilege-cognizant white script, that is, she must remain cognizant of the ways in which she is privileged (or privileges herself) because of her phenotypic whiteness. According to Bailey, privilege- cognizant whites are race traitors "who refuse to animate the scripts whites are expected to perform, and who are unfaithful to worldviews whites are expected to hold. ,.68 In this way, privilege-cognizant whites are committed to "doing whiteness differently. ,.69 If "race is constituted through the repetition of acts, verbal and nonverbal, that continue to communicate difference," then whites must engage in **counterstylized iterative anti-whitely acts**. 7o It is not easy to discern the subtle and yet pervasive ways in which the ideology of whiteness profoundly distorts mutually flourishing forms of human relationality. Contesting the normative status of whiteness "means living in constant struggle, always working with self and those around you. . . . It is a process that . . . [builds on] the notion that all benefit when whiteness inflicts less violence [on] others in the world.~,7I But it is important to note, in Beauvoirian terms~ that whiteness is like an "inhuman [idol] to which one will not hesitate to sacrifice" all that is of value~ even the white body itself. Therefore~ the serious world of whiteness is a very dangerous world. Whiteness makes tyrants out of human beings. The white elides "the subjectivity of his [her] choice" through the constitution of whiteness as an absolute value that "is being asserted through him [her]." This is done at the expense of white accountability. In this way, one is able to deny "the subjectivity and the freedom of others~ to such an extent that, sacrificing them to the [idol of whiteness]" means absolutely nothing. On this score, it is accurate to describe whiteness as a form of fanaticism that is "as formidable as the fanaticism of passion.,,72 Whiteness as fanaticism **occludes** other voices from speaking~ and other bodies from being, and other ways of **revealing** and **performing** the depths of~ and the promises inherent in~ human reality as homo possibilities. So, don't be fooled. Whiteness is not the best that history has to offer. This conclusion signals the historical bankruptcy of whiteness as an ethical exemplar, the problematic self- certainty and narcissism of whiteness, the historical contingency of whiteness~ and the possibility for new and nonhegemonic hermeneutic horizons.

## 1NR

### Alt and Perm

#### Our criticism agrees that liberatory analysis is important but its ultimately incomplete without examining other intersecting axis’ of oppression – they make that examination impossible but not starting with interrogated the oppressor within us – the 1AC description of oppression existing externally depends on either/or dichotomous thinking that makes the permutation impossible – Their additive approach analytically assimilates and displaces the lived realities of those oppressed people that sit on the intersections – only the alternative can account for the overlapping and intersectional nature of all of our identities

Collins says in 2013 that (Patricia Hill, Prof of Sociology @ University of Maryland at College Park, *On Intellectual Activism*)

The true focus of revolutionary change is never merely the oppressive situations which we seek to escape, but that Piece of the oppressor which is planted deep within each of us. -AUDRE LORDE, from Sister Outsider (123) AUDRE LORDE'S STATEMENT raises a troublesome issue for scholars and activists working for social change. While many of us have little difficulty assessing our own victimization within some major system of oppression, whether it be by race, social class, religion, sexual orientation, ethnicity, age, or gender, we typically fail to see how our thoughts and actions uphold someone else's subordination. Thus, White feminists routinely point with confidence to their oppression as women but resist seeing how much their white skin privileges them. African Americans who possess eloquent analyses of racism often persist in viewing poor White women as symbols of white power. The radical Left fares little better. "If only people of color and women could see their true class interests," they argue, "class solidarity would eliminate racism and sexism." In essence, each group identifies the type of oppression with which it feels most comfortable as being fundamental and classifies all other types as being of lesser importance. Oppression is full of such contradictions. Errors in political judgment that we make concerning how we teach our courses, what we tell our children, and which organizations are worthy of our time, talents, and financial support flow smoothly from errors in theoretical analysis about the nature of oppression and activism. Once we realize that there are few pure victims or oppressors, and that each one of us derives varying amounts of penalty and privilege from the multiple systems of oppression that frame our lives, then we will be in a position to see the need for new ways of thought and action. To get at that "piece of the oppressor which is planted deep within each of us," we need at least two things. First, we need new visions of what oppression is, new categories of analysis that are inclusive of race, class, and gender as distinctive yet interlocking structures of oppression. Adhering to a stance of comparing and ranking oppressions-the proverbial "I'm more oppressed than you"-locks us all into a dangerous dance of competing for attention, resources, and theoretical supremacy. Instead, I suggest that we examine our different experiences within the more fundamental relationship of domination and subordination. To focus on the particular arrangements that race or class or gender take in our time and place without seeing these structures as sometimes parallel and sometimes interlocking dimensions of the more fundamental relationship of domination and subordination may temporarily ease our consciences. But while such thinking may lead to short-term social reforms, it is simply inadequate for the task of bringing about long-term social transformation. While race, class, and gender as categories of analysis are essential in helping us understand the structural bases of domination and subordination, new ways of thinking that are not accompanied by new ways of acting offer incomplete prospects for change. To get at that "piece of the oppressor which is planted deep within each of us," we also need to change our daily behavior. Currently, we are all enmeshed in a complex web of problematic relationships that grant our mirror images full human subjectivity while stereotyping and objectifying those most different from ourselves. We often assume that the people we work with, teach, send our children to school with, and sit next to in conferences such as this will act and feel in prescribed ways because they belong to given race, social class, or gender categories. These judgments by category must be replaced with fully human relationships that transcend the legitimate differences created by race, class, and gender as categories of analysis. We require new categories of connection, new visions of what our relationships with one another can be. Our task is immense. We must first recognize race, class, and gender as interlocking categories of analysis that together cultivate profound differences in our personal biographies. But then we must transcend those very differences by reconceptualizing race, class, and gender to create new categories of connection. My presentation today addresses this need for new patterns of thought and action. I focus on two basic questions. First, how can we reconceptualize race, class, and gender as categories of analysis? Second, how can we transcend the barriers created by our experiences with race, class, and gender oppression to build the types of coalitions essential for social change? To address these questions, I contend that we must acquire new theories of how race, class, and gender have shaped the experiences not just of women of color but also of all groups. Moreover, we must see the connections between these categories of analysis and the personal issues in our everyday lives, particularly our scholarship, our teaching, and our relationships with our colleagues and students. As Audre Lorde points out, change starts with self, and relationships that we have with those around us must always be the primary site for social change. How Can We Reconceptualize Race, Class, and Gender as Categories of Analysis? To me, we must shift our discourse away from additive analyses of oppression. Such approaches are typically based on two key premises. First, they depend on either/or, dichotomous thinking. Persons, things, and ideas are conceptualized in terms of their opposites. For example, Black/White, man/woman, thought/ feeling, and fact/opinion are defined in oppositional terms. Thought and feeling are not seen as two different and interconnected ways of approaching truth that can coexist in scholarship and teaching. Instead, feeling is defined as antithetical to reason, as its opposite. Despite the fact that we all have "both/and" identities (I am both a college professor and a mother-I don't stop being a mother when I drop my child off at school, or forget everything I learned while scrubbing the toilet), we persist in trying to classify each other in either/or categories. I live each day as an African American woman, a race/gender-specific experience. And I am not alone. Everyone in this room has a race/gender/class-specific identity. Either/or, dichotomous thinking is especially troublesome when applied to theories of oppression because every individual must be classified as being either oppressed or not oppressed. The both/and position of simultaneously being oppressed and oppressor becomes conceptually impossible. A second premise of additive analyses of oppression is that these dichotomous differences must be ranked. One side of the dichotomy is typically labeled "dominant" and the other "subordinate." Thus, Whites rule Blacks, men are deemed superior to women, and reason is seen as being preferable to emotion. Applying this premise to discussions of oppression leads to the assumption that oppression can be quantified, and that some groups are oppressed more than others. I am frequently asked, "Which has been most oppressive to you, your status as a Black person or your status as a woman?" What I am really being asked to do is divide myself into little boxes and rank my various statuses. If I experience oppression as a both/and phenomenon, why should I analyze it any differently? Additive analyses of oppression rest squarely on the twin pillars of either/or thinking and the necessity to quantify and rank all relationships to know where one stands. Such approaches typically see African American women as being more oppressed than everyone else because the majority of Black women experience the negative effects of race, class, and gender oppression simultaneously. In essence, if you add together separate oppressions, you are left with a grand oppression greater than the sum of its parts. I am not denying that specific groups experience oppression more harshly than others-lynching is certainly objectively worse than being held up as a sex object. But we must be careful not to confuse this issue of the saliency of one type of oppression in people's lives with a theoretical stance positing the interlocking nature of oppression. Race, class, and gender may all structure a situation but may not be equally visible and/or important in people's self-definitions. In certain contexts, such as the antebellum American South and contemporary South Africa, racial oppression is more visibly salient, while in other contexts, such as Haiti, El Salvador, and Nicaragua, social class oppression may be more apparent. For middle-class White women, gender may assume experiential primacy unavailable to poor Hispanic women struggling with the ongoing issues of low-paid jobs and the frustrations of the welfare bureaucracy. This recognition that one category may have salience over another in a given time and place does not minimize the theoretical importance of assuming that race, class, and gender as categories of analysis structure all relationships. To move toward new visions of what oppression is, I think that we need to ask new questions. How are relationships of domination and subordination structured and maintained in the American political economy? How do race, class, and gender function as parallel and interlocking systems that shape this basic relationship of domination and subordination? Questions such as these promise to move us away from futile theoretical struggles concerned with ranking oppressions and toward analyses that assume race, class, and gender are all present in any given setting, even if one appears more visible and salient than the others. Our task becomes redefined as one of reconceptualizing oppression by uncovering the connections among race, class, and gender as categories of analysis.