## 1AC

I am a woman who is split by categories, by worlds and words.¶ The color line is my spine. On one side golden hands are moving masa across corn husks; on the other side soft cream hands are moving to hold me. On one side of my back I carry la Virgen dc Guadalupe, La Llorona, La Malinche; on the other, Mother Mary and Eve. On one side are brown women, black women, women who know the taste of their¶ color, sometimes salty, sometimes sweet, sometimes bitter like poison.¶ On the other side are white women. Some know the taste of color from¶ the tongues of their lovers, or from the mouths of their friends. But¶ many are numbed to the taste, more accustomed to the metallic tang of¶ privilege.¶ The color line is my spine. Sometimes it aches with the collision of¶ color lines — when it’s the light, bright guera baby they boast about,¶ when the love between women fails because the color line splits them, as¶ I struggle to write my-self-in-community with integrity.¶ Sometimes I imagine this spine is as a string of pearls, moving to a¶ synchronized rhythm of blood and bone. Sometimes I can breathe in¶ the face of these fears, create a sense of belonging that allows me to stand¶ with pride, shoulder to shoulder with my sisters.¶ It takes years of daily practice to hold this body together.¶ And I know there are others like me. Las mestizas, las vendidas, the¶ race traitors, the halfies, those who tremble at claims to authenticity. People who are brown and black and Native by blood or by belonging,¶ but who look white. Whose hues arc read in ways we cannot predict,¶ cannot control by white people as the color of “one of us,” by people of color as the color of dominance.¶ But there’s a limit to skin color politics. There’s the color of the body, and then there’s the color of the commitment that burns like hot blue flame in our hearts. How will we, the ones you can’t tell about, make¶ ourselves known? Even as the white world assumes our sameness, the¶ dark color of our politics burns inside of us.¶ Our work is to turn ourselves inside out. To locate ourselves through¶ our loyalty and our bravery and our willingness to fight for radical visions. Our work is to risk privilege, to stain the color of our skin with the fluids of our hearts, to squeeze our hearts and leave the handprints¶ on our bodies.

#### That’s Aimee Carillo Rowe from 2008 - Associate Professor in the Rhetoric Department and the Project on Rhetoric of Inquiry program at the University of Iowa <Aimee Carrillo. “Power Lines; On the Subject of Feminist Alliances” Duke University Press. 2008. Pg xix>

**But this isn’t just about being targeted, it’s about the targeting we are a part of every day**

**that is made possible by the way white supremacist thinking and dominant ideologies lay the foundation for the exclusion, oppression and victimization of difference. White supremacist thinking maintains its power through binaristic thinking that always places us on one side of the color line or the other when we really exist at the border between the oppressor and the oppressed. This notion is what allows both complacency and active participation in rendering bodies disposable**

bell hooks explains in 2012…, Distinguished Professor in Residence at Barea

(Bell, Writing Beyond Race: Living Theory and Practice, pg. 43)

Clearly the future of diversity lies in creating greater awareness and greater critical consciousness about the importance of ending domination, of challenging and changing white supremacy. Riane Eisler urges in her partnership model that we shift from an us-versus-them attitude to a worldview where we place the “same standards of human rights and responsibilities provided by the partnership model to all cultures.” She contends: “In a world where technologies of communication and destruction span the globe almost instantaneously, creating a better world is a matter of enlightened self-interest.” Now more than ever we need to create learning communities that make learning the theory and practice of diversity essential aspects of curriculum. In my recent book Teaching Critical Thinking: Practical Wisdom, I call attention to the way in which issues of diversity both inside and outside the classroom are slowly being pushed back into the realm of silence and misinformation. As I wrote: “More than ever before, students need to learn from unbiased perspectives, be they conservative or radical. More than ever before, students and teachers need to fully understand differences of nationality, race, sex, class, and sexuality if we are to create ways of knowing that reinforce education as the practice of freedom.” Learning to challenge and change binary thinking – the us-and-them paradigm – is one way to create a foundation that can be sustained. Holding onto binary thinking actually keeps dominator culture in place, for one aspect of that culture is the projection outward onto an enemy, an “other,” whenever things go wrong, and this casting of blame in turns helps to promote a culture of vicitimization. When we are more energized by the practice of blaming then we are by efforts to create transformation, we not only cannot find relief from suffering, we are creating the conditions that help keep us stuck in the status quo. Our attachment to blaming, to identifying the oppressor stems from the fear that if we cannot unequivocally and absolutely state who the enemy is then we cannot know how to organize resistance struggle. In the insightful book Ruling Your World: Ancient Strategies for Modern Life, Mipham Rinpoche talks about learning to understand others rather than blaming them. He shares: “I remember my father and other of the older generation of Tibetan lamas saying that they did not blame the Communist Chinese for the destruction of Tibet. They felt that blaming the Chinese would not solve anything. It would only trap Tibetans in the past.” Similarly, any critical examination of the history of the civil rights struggle in the United States will show that greater progress was made when leaders emphasized the importance of forgiving one’s enemies, working for reconciliation and the formation of a beloved community, rather than angry retaliation. Casting blame and calling for vengeance was an aspect of militant movements for black power that have really failed to sustain the climate of unlearning racism previously forged by nonviolent anti-racist struggle. In the aftermath of sixties rebellion, the more black folks were encouraged to vent rage, to “blame” all white folks for race-based exploitation and domination, and to eschew any notion of forgiveness, the more an internalized sense of victimhood became the norm. Tragically, today many black folks are more despairing of any possibility that racism can be effectively challenged and changed than at other similar historical moments when white supremacist aggression was more overtly life threatening. Unenlightened white folks who proclaim either that racism has ended or that they are not responsible for slavery engage in a politics of blame wherin they disavow political reality to insist that black folk are never really victims of racism but are the agents of their own suffering. Dualistic thinking, which is at the core of dominator thinking, teaches people that there is always the oppressed and the oppressor, a victim and a victimizer. Hence there is always someone to blame. Moving past the ideology of blame to a politics of accountability is a difficult move to make in a society where almost all political organizing, whether conservative or radical, has been structured around the binary of good guys and bad guys. Accountability is a much more complex issue. A politics of blame allows a contemporary white person to make statements like, “My family never owned slaves,” or “Slavery is over. Why can’t they just get over it?” In contrast, a politics of accountability would emphasize that all white people benefit from the privileges accrued from racist exploitation past and present and therefore are accountable for changing and transforming white supremacy and racism. Accountability is a more expansive concept because it opens a field of possibility where in we are all compelled to move beyond blame to see where our responsibility lies. Seeing clearly that we live within a dominator culture of imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy, I am compelled to locate where my responsibility lies. In some circumstances I am in a position to be a victimizer. If I only lay claim to those aspects of the system where I define myself as the oppressed and someone else as my oppressor then I continually fail to see the larger picture. Any effort I might make to challenge domination is likely to fail if I am not looking accurately at the circumstances that create suffering, and thus seeing the larger picture. After more than thirty years of talking to folks about domination, I can testify that masses of folks in our society – both black and white – resist seeing the larger picture.

#### The color line is my spine. In order to reconceptualize our identities as fixed on one side of the power line or the other we must understand be longing – that’s “be” space “longing” as two words – because it demonstrates the way we do not belong to a fixed identity but are always longing toward different intersections of identity that we encounter. We have to understand the way that white supremacist thinking calls us to long to it – only this recognition allows us to challenge the way power works *through* us in order to *invert* the way the federal government and white supremacist thinking is able to target disposable bodies

**Aimee** Carillo Rowe writes in 2008 - Associate Professor in the Rhetoric Department and the Project on Rhetoric of Inquiry program at the University of Iowa <Aimee Carrillo. “Power Lines; On the Subject of Feminist Alliances” Duke University Press. 2008. Pgs 25-27>

This chapter aims to provide a glimpse at what is at stake in a politics¶ of relation. The theoretical frame I outline gestures toward what is¶ possible when feminists of privilege account for their investments in¶ and complicity with domination. In this sense, the frame I outline under¶ the rubric of ”be longing” is, in many ways, inconsistent with the logics of exclusion and segregation that arise in the following chapters. This¶ disjuncture marks the fragmented location of the Chicana falsa, of the¶ bridge called my back, of the abyss between what constitutes the deeply embedded structures of racism that constitute our daily lives and the sketch of what is possible as we attend to the institutional intimacies of this dailiness. It speaks to where we arc, even as it gestures toward what¶ might be possible. In many ways it underscores the power of hegemonic belongings to interpellate subjects to remain complicit with the strictures of segregation and the affective, material, and political consequences for doing so.¶ This chapter fills out the argument that whom we love is political.¶ The sites of our belonging constitute how we see the world, what we¶ value, who we are (becoming). The meaning of self is never individual,¶ but a shifting set of relations that we move in and out of, often without¶ reflection. I aim to render palpable the political conditions and effects of¶ our belonging to gesture toward deep reflection about the selves we are¶ creating as a function of where we place our bodies, and with whom we¶ build our affective ties. I call this placing a politics of relation. It moves¶ theories of locating the subject to a relational notion of the subject. It¶ moves a politics of location from the individual to a coalitional notion of the subject. The chapter title plays on the notion of interpellation. Louis Althusser’s well-known parable (1998) of a cop hailing someone, “Hey, you¶ there!” reveals this function of power. The subject must respond to the¶ hailing because she recognizes that it is she who is called. Whether she¶ chooses to run from the police officer, or turn to face her; whether she¶ complies or rebels, who she is constituted in her recognition that she has¶ been hailed — her recognition of that she is the subject of this hailing.¶ “Be longing” seeks to provide a potentially resistive hailing, or what¶ Chela Sandoval (2000) calls “reverse interpellation.” “Be” and “longing’ phrased as two words, placed beside each other, not run together,¶ phrase a command that disrupts, and thus renders visible, the terms that¶ inform “belonging” The command is to “be” “longing,” not to “be still,”¶ or “be quiet,” but to be longing. This being is a command to which we¶ are already responding. We are always already being hailed by our various (be)longings from the moment of our birth, from those moments¶ well before our births: moments of conquest and settlement, of miscegenation and antimiscegenation, of mixing and blending and resistance. We tend to overlook the ways that power is transmitted through our affective ties. Whom we love, the communities that we live in,¶ whom we expend our emotional energies building ties with these¶ connections are all functions of power. So the command of this reverse¶ interpellation signified by the empty space between “be” and “longing” is to call attention to the politics at stake in our belongings, to¶ attend to the ways in which our being is formed through our longings,¶ and to envision alternative modes of interpellation. How might our¶ subjects be constituted if we were hailed by the needs and demands,¶ struggles and joys, of those whose lives and loves are excluded from the realm of our affective economics (see Butler 2004b, Gross 2006)?¶ This work is to reverse, or better, to multiply the sites of power that¶ hail us, urging us to consider the ways in which power becomes intelligible through a politics of love. This shift gestures toward a frame in¶ which we imagine the subject as engaged in a continual process of placing herself at the edge of herself and leaning and tipping toward the¶ others to whom she belongs, or with whom she longs to be — or those¶ others who become her. Jean Luc Nancy (1991) calls this tipping¶ the clinamen in his efforts to think the relationship among the limits¶ of community the failure of communism, and the formation of the¶ “individual” He writes: “One cannot make a world with simple atoms.¶ There has to be a clinamen. There has to be an inclination or an inclining from one toward the other, of one by the other, or from one to¶ the other?’ The clinamen evokes the moment in which poetry “swerves”¶ from its structured path (Thom Swiss, personal communication, December 9, 2003); the path from which the subject would potentially¶ swerve is that of the lone traveler, the individual. In its most radical form, this swerve would entail unmooring the subject from the individual, framing her becoming as always already structured through¶ the various communal sites into which she is inserted and inserts herself. There is no subject prior to infinitely shifting and contingent¶ relations of belonging which temporarily define the contours of her¶ being.¶ A politics of relation may be understood through the metaphor of a¶ body in motion: this body “does not coincide with itself. It coincides¶ with its own transition: its own variation” (Massumi 2002, ). As with¶ the body, the subject does not arrive at its becoming once and for all¶ through its stagnant signification within a particular moment in time,¶ although salient moments may stand out as particularly punctuated.¶ Rather, the subject arrives again and again to her own becoming¶ through a series of transitions across time and space, communities¶ and contexts - throughout the course of her life. She may be known,¶ then, not through her fixity within logics of the mythic “I” but rather by¶ virtue of her own variation. Belonging is the condition of possibility for¶ this variation (Segrest 2002). A politics of relation is not striving toward absolute alterity to the subject, but rather to tip the concept of¶ subjectivity away from individualism and in the direction of the inclination toward the other so that being is constituted not first through the atomized self, but through its own longings to be with. Belonging precedes being.¶ I seek an alternative to a notion of identity that begins with ‘I’ as¶ does the inscription “I-dentity’ which announces itself through its fixity: “I am . . .“ to a sense of “self” that is radically inclined toward others, toward the communities to which we belong, with whom we¶ long to be, and to whom we feel accountable. Perhaps “positionality’¶ with its multiply placed “I‘s’ is a more appropriate signifier. This is the¶ space I seek to name in the following section of this chapter, to be¶ revisited in the third section. I think of it as differential belonging -¶ shifting the terms of interpellation from the individual subject to the¶ spaces between them. These belongings may be multiple, shifting, and¶ even contradictory (in terms of the norms they produce, the politics¶ that drive them, the conditions for loving they request, or demand):¶ family, neighborhood, friends, allies, colleagues, social groups, lovers,¶ nations, transnations. These sites of belonging are political as they operate in relation to power: with and through, as well as against, in resistance to, and possibly in directions that redefine and redistribute it.

**White supremacist thinking operates by locating the subject in a fixed identity and eliminating it – in this way it has unlimited range to target and kill because of the way it can place black, brown, and feminine bodies on a kill list based on false notions about their identity. White supremacist thinking not only gains power through its ability to make intelligible and target our bodies but also through the maintenance of both whiteness and masculinity as unintelligible forces that cannot be targeted in return.**

**Aimee Carillo Rowe explains…** - Associate Professor in the Rhetoric Department and the Project on Rhetoric of Inquiry program at the University of Iowa <Aimee Carrillo. “Power Lines; On the Subject of Feminist Alliances” Duke University Press. 2008. Pgs 36-37>

My interest in these forces arises from my own shifting notions of¶ belonging across time and space. Once, I strongly identified with white and heterosexual belongings. Racial assimilation is a big part of it: all of¶ us striving to gain power by fitting in, by putting those who hold power¶ at ease by being like them, by belonging to them. I identify with Cherrie¶ Moraga’s account of her “mother’s desire to protect her children from¶ poverty and illiteracy” (2000, ‘1-3) through my own experience, that my¶ mother ushered us into Anglo cultural belongings, although we were not¶ really at risk for either poverty or illiteracy. Yet the sentiment that the¶ “wolf was always at the door” lay like a heat wave over our suburban¶ home in Riverside. My increasing awareness of white longings for¶ inclusion-as-safety in an otherwise unsafe world of scarcity was accompanied by my desire for intimate belonging to and with women. The¶ latter grew, and grows, with the help of my friends, like Rebecca who¶ showed me how my heterosexual privilege excluded and erased her. I¶ never realized that as the popular white male academic held the door¶ open for me, it slammed in her face. I never realized how I participated in¶ slamming doors on other women, let alone my best friend. But she¶ taught me that, through wretched moments in which our rage got played¶ Out on each other. Rage that is now consolidated and redirected as love.¶ One of the central preoccupations of the critical study of whiteness is¶ to name and specify the particularities of whiteness to reveal how it¶ secures its power through its seeming universality. Whiteness defines the¶ norm within racial registers against which the other is defined, and thus¶ always secures power through its unmarked positioning within the field¶ of race. As Ruth Frankenberg writes in her founding text within this¶ field, White Women, Race Matters: ‘marking whiteness’ displaces it from¶ the unmarked, unnamed status that is itself an effect of dominance”¶ (ï 993, 6). How might we rethink such effects, as well as the normalizing¶ processes through which they are produced, through cartographies of¶ belonging? One move that some scholars within this field are making is¶ to call attention to social processes through which white privilege is¶ maintained. Alda Hurtado notes the paradoxical “oxymoron” of “white¶ solidarity” when she states, “Ultimately, white privilege depends on its¶ members not betraying the unspoken, nonconscious power dynamics socialized in the intimacy of their families” (1996, J +9). White solidarity¶ is a social practice that interpellates not only white people, for, as GeorgeLipsirt illustrates in his reference to Clarence Thomas, “one way of¶ becoming an insider is by participating in the exclusion of other outsiders. An individual might even secure a seat on the Supreme Court on¶this basis” (1998, viii). By drawing attention to the intimate practices of¶ whiteness as a set of exclusionary social practices, Hurtado’s and Lipsitz’s¶ insights expose the intimate structures of whiteness, not only as an identity to which one reverts or aspires in order to gain racial privilege,¶ but more important, a set of regulatory practices to which one must¶ submit in order to establish oneself as insider. They reveal those exclu¶ sionary practices to which we submit in order to belong. “Willful igno¶ rance’ Jane Lazarrc (içç) calls it. In this sense, we must understand whiteness as a mode of belonging¶ in order to dismantle the force of its privileging and marginalizing tendencies. ‘This reading reveals an underbelly of whiteness that may be¶ exploited by those who seek to challenge its juridical apparatuses. if the¶ hegemony of whiteness is contingent upon both whites and people of¶ color abiding by its norms, and striving to belong within its ranks¶ then what happens when we begin to challenge these norms and seek¶ alternative, counterhegemonic sites and modes of belonging? How do¶ we assess the resistive or recuperative effects of such transracial identifications as passing for white, assimilating to whiteness for people of¶ color, or for white slumming across racialized, classed, and heterosexed¶ barriers? I return to this question in the next section, hut now I wish¶ to make the point that belongings in which we become accountable to¶ power can produce a space of alterity, a space of resistance, and spaces¶ that disrupt these hegemonic forms of belonging. Belonging, then, is¶ intimately tied to power. It is an affective force that can be used to¶ reproduce and/or to challenge whiteness as a hegemonic form.

#### Power works through us, not just upon us. While we would never argue we can *transcend* our social location we should recognize the ways in which whiteness operates in the places we least expect.

bell hooks writes in 2012, Distinguished Professor in Residence at Barea

(bell, Writing Beyond Race: Living Theory and Practice, pg. 9)

In order to talk openly and honestly about race in the United States it is helpful to begin with the understanding that it is white supremacist thinking and practice that has been the political foundation undergirding all systems of domination based on skin color and ethnicity. When describing the political system that we live within here in the United States, more often than not. I use the complicated phrase imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy. This phrase is useful precisely because it does not prioritize one system over another but rather offers us a way to think about the interlocking systems that work together to uphold and maintain cultures of domination.¶ However, in talking and writing about these systems for more than thirty years, I have found that most citizens of the United States resist the notion that ours is a nation founded and colonized on a foundation of white supremacist thought and action. And yet, as a nation we have always had a public discourse about race and racism. And, when leaders of our nation have called for a national dialogue on these issues, there has been little resistance. The United States was colonized and founded by a white supremacist politics that necessitated endless thinking, writing, and discussion about race. White folks from all places and classes, speaking all manner of languages, migrated here in the hopes of creating a better, more prosperous, freer life for themselves. They, for the most part, collectively, accepted a national identity based on the fictions of race and racism created by white supremacist thought and action. Bonding on the basis of shared whiteness provides the foundation for a sense of shared meaning, values, and purpose. With the battle cry of preserving whiteness, imperialist colonization became the belief system that supported the mass murder of indigenous natives, the blatant stealing of their lands, and the creation of segregated reservations. Despite the presence of African individuals who came to the so-called new world before Columbus—as documented in Ivan Van Sertima's seminal work They Came Before Columbus— white supremacist thinking and action condoned the enslavement of black Africans, supporting their brutal exploitation and oppression.¶ Living as they did in close proximity with enslaved black folks, relying on them to serve obediently and subserviently, white dominators needed a psychological mode of colonization that would keep everyone in check, that would teach everyone their place in the race-based hierarchy that is the aim of white supremacist thinking and practice. At this point, notions of white supremacy were fluid and constantly changing to meet the needs of dominating white colonizers. When white supremacist logic decreed that all black folks were diseased and unclean, that train of thought then had to be shifted a bit to leave just enough room for it to be deemed acceptable for some black folks to cook for white owners and to care for their children. When white supremacist logic decreed that the brains of black folks were smaller than those of whites, thus rendering them intellectually inferior, and then well- educated black genius asserted itself, there had to be space made within the theory of white superiority for exceptions. Clearly, one of the awesome aspects of white supremacist logic has been its fluidity, its ability to adjust and change according to need and circumstance.¶ Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century, dialogues about white supremacy were common. Few, if any, white folks would have found it odd for there to be silence on the subject. Yet talk of white supremacy in our society is deemed not only taboo, but also irrelevant. When addressed openly there is always a listener eager to insist that the term white supremacy has little meaning in the contemporary United States, that it is too harsh a reality to be relevant to discussions of race and racism.¶ When I speak with audiences about imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy, the one piece of these interlocking political systems that individuals most resist acknowledging is white supremacy. And yet if we cannot as a culture accept the way white supremacist thinking and practice informs some aspect of our lives irrespective of skin color, then we will never move beyond race. Unlike race and racism, which does not overtly harm masses of folk in ways that causes direct damage, white supremacy is the covert ideology that is the silent cause of harm and trauma. Think of the black children, both rich and poor, who watch long hours of television that imprints their young minds with the notion that white is good and black is bad. All over the United States, parents who assume they have taught their families to be actively anti-racist are shocked when they discover that their children harbor intense anti-black feelings. This is just one example. Another example might be the interracial couple in which the white individual proclaims their undying love for a black partner but then later in conversation talks about their belief that black people are intellectually inferior. This is not an expression of conventional racial prejudice. It does however remind us that one can be intimate with black folks, claim even to love us, and yet still hold white supremacist attitudes about the nature of black identity.¶ Thinking about white supremacy as the foundation of race and racism is crucial because it allows us to see beyond skin color. It allows us to look at all the myriad ways our daily actions can be imbued by white supremacist thinking no matter our race. Certainly, race and racism will never become unimportant if we cannot recognize the need to consistently challenge white supremacy. When cultural studies emerged as a context where the issue of whiteness and white privilege could be studied and theorized, it appeared that a new way of thinking and talking about race was emerging. Even though scholars wrote much about white privilege, they did not always endeavor to show the link between underlying notions of white supremacy and white privilege. Overracializing whiteness then made it seem as though white skin and the privileges that it allows were the primary issues, and not the white supremacist ways of thinking and acting that are expressed by folks of all skin colors. It may very well be that the re-centering of whiteness has helped silence the necessary theories and practice that are needed if we are as a nation to truly learn how to be rid of racism.¶ Similarly, feminist focus on gender, which initially provided amazing insights into the nature of patriarchy and gave hope to those struggling to bring sexist exploitation and domination to an end, was soon usurped by a depoliticized focus on gender. We now have much published work that looks at race and gender but not from a standpoint that is feminist or anti-racist. This is a deeply disturbing trend. Among those of us who have spent our lifetimes critically thinking and writing about ways to transform both our individual lives and our society so that systems of domination can be challenged and changed, there is a growing mood of frustration and despair. We feel we are constantly deconstructing and laying the groundwork for alternatives without making the interventions in how folks live daily that are needed if our society is to be utterly changed.¶ Significantly, in the last ten years, there have been so many cutbacks at colleges and universities that the longed for diversity of faculty and staff not only is not happening, it is unlikely to ever happen. At many institutions, when jobs appear, conventional hierarchies of race and gender fall back into place. This reminds many critical thinkers of how important it is to encourage everyone to learn new points of view, to engage in unbiased thinking and teaching. The burden of learning new points of view should not have been placed solely on the shoulders of people of color. Intervention that helps us all better understand the way interlocking systems of domination work together is consistently needed. The motley collection of essays in Writing Beyond Race all emerge from my efforts to look at the ways race, gender, and class are written and talked about today. After the feminist and cultural studies heyday, where for a time so much new ground was broken and radical discussions of non-biased standpoints were made prominent, these discourses are suddenly no longer at the forefront of our consciousness. While the subjects of race, gender, and class are still talked about, they are more and more divorced from discussions of ending biases in standpoint, and so they risk becoming mere topics of inquiry with no relation to transformative learning or practical change.¶ In these essays I focus attention on issues of accountability, standpoint, and white supremacy. Specifically. I examine those cultural productions which give the surface appearance of addressing topics of race, gender, and class, while merely reinserting ideologies of domination. Not wanting to simply paint a bleak picture of where things stand, I address in several essays what allows us to bond across differences, placing emphasis on patterns of positive change. Most importantly, I am attempting to think and write beyond the boundaries which keep us all overracialized. To find a way to move beyond race is not only the goal of critical thinking, it is the only path to emotional longevity, the only true path to liberation.

**Therefore, we advocate differential belonging as a means of ending targeted killing.**