## The K

#### The struggle over the question of who counts as human is THE question of the debate—the system of colonialism instituted by European powers in the 15th and 16th centuries haunts the present in the form of coloniality—an epistemological structure that privileges the Western subject as the only legitimate expression of human knowledge. The question of Latin American engagement can only be answered when we first unsettle the coloniality of knowledge and being that has demarcated the majority of the world as subhuman populations given over to death.

Wynter 03 (Sylvia, Professor of Romance Languages at Stanford University, “Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom

Towards the Human, After Man, Its Overrepresentation—An Argument,” CR: The New Centennial Review, 3.3 (2003) 257-337, MUSE)

THE ARGUMENT PROPOSES THAT THE STRUGGLE OF OUR NEW MILLENNIUM WILL be one between the ongoing imperative of securing the well-being of our present ethnoclass (i.e., Western bourgeois) conception of the human, Man, which overrepresents itself as if it were the human itself, and that of securing the well-being, and therefore the full cognitive and behavioral autonomy of the human species itself/ourselves. Because of this overrepresentation, which is defined in the first part of the title as the Coloniality of Being/ Power/Truth/Freedom, any attempt to unsettle the coloniality of power will call for the unsettling of this overrepresentation as the second and now purely secular form of what Aníbal Quijano identifies as the "Racism/ Ethnicism complex," on whose basis the world of modernity was brought into existence from the fifteenth/sixteenth centuries onwards (Quijano 1999, 2000), 2 and of what Walter Mignolo identifies as the foundational "colonial difference" on which the world of modernity was to institute itself (Mignolo 1999, 2000). 3 The correlated hypothesis here is that all our present struggles with respect to race, class, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, struggles over the environment, global warming, severe climate change, the sharply unequal distribution of the earth resources (20 percent of the world's peoples own 80 percent of its resources, consume two-thirds of its food, and are responsible for 75 percent of its ongoing pollution, with this leading to two billion of [End Page 260] earth's peoples living relatively affluent lives while four billion still live on the edge of hunger and immiseration, to the dynamic of overconsumption on the part of the rich techno-industrial North paralleled by that of overpopulation on the part of the dispossessed poor, still partly agrarian worlds of the South 4 )—these are all differing facets of the central ethnoclass Man vs. Human struggle. Central to this struggle also is the usually excluded and invisibilized situation of the category identified by Zygmunt Bauman as the "New Poor" (Bauman 1987). That is, as a category defined at the global level by refugee/economic migrants stranded outside the gates of the rich countries, as the postcolonial variant of Fanon's category of les damnés (Fanon 1963)—with this category in the United States coming to comprise the criminalized majority Black and dark-skinned Latino inner-city males now made to man the rapidly expanding prison-industrial complex, together with their female peers—the kicked-about Welfare Moms—with both being part of the ever-expanding global, transracial category of the homeless/the jobless, the semi-jobless, the criminalized drug-offending prison population. So that if we see this category of the damnés that is internal to (and interned within) the prison system of the United States as the analog form of a global archipelago, constituted by the Third- and Fourth-World peoples of the so-called "underdeveloped" areas of the world—most totally of all by the peoples of the continent of Africa (now stricken with AIDS, drought, and ongoing civil wars, and whose bottommost place as the most impoverished of all the earth's continents is directly paralleled by the situation of its Black Diaspora peoples, with Haiti being produced and reproduced as the most impoverished nation of the Americas)—a systemic pattern emerges. This pattern is linked to the fact that while in the post-sixties United States, as Herbert Gans noted recently, the Black population group, of all the multiple groups comprising the post-sixties social hierarchy, has once again come to be placed at the bottommost place of that hierarchy (Gans, 1999), with all incoming new nonwhite/non-Black groups, as Gans's fellow sociologist Andrew Hacker (1992) earlier pointed out, coming to claim "normal" North American identity by the putting of visible distance between themselves and the Black population group (in effect, claiming "normal" human status by distancing themselves from the group that is still made to occupy the nadir, [End Page 261] "nigger" rung of being human within the terms of our present ethnoclass Man's overrepresentation of its "descriptive statement" [Bateson 1969] as if it were that of the human itself), then the struggle of our times, one that has hitherto had no name, is the struggle against this overrepresentation. As a struggle whose first phase, the Argument proposes, was first put in place (if only for a brief hiatus before being coopted, reterritorialized [Godzich 1986]) by the multiple anticolonial social-protest movements and intellectual challenges of the period to which we give the name, "The Sixties." The further proposal here is that, although the brief hiatus during which the sixties' large-scale challenge based on multiple issues, multiple local terrains of struggles (local struggles against, to use Mignolo's felicitous phrase, a "global design" [Mignolo 2000]) erupted was soon to be erased, several of the issues raised then would continue to be articulated, some in sanitized forms (those pertaining to the category defined by Bauman as "the seduced"), others in more harshly intensified forms (those pertaining to Bauman's category of the "repressed" [Bauman 1987]). Both forms of "sanitization" would, however, function in the same manner as the lawlike effects of the post-sixties' vigorous discursive and institutional re-elaboration of the central overrepresentation, which enables the interests, reality, and well-being of the empirical human world to continue to be imperatively subordinated to those of the now globally hegemonic ethnoclass world of "Man." This, in the same way as in an earlier epoch and before what Howard Winant identifies as the "immense historical rupture" of the "Big Bang" processes that were to lead to a contemporary modernity defined by the "rise of the West" and the "subjugation of the rest of us" (Winant 1994)—before, therefore, the secularizing intellectual revolution of Renaissance humanism, followed by the decentralizing religious heresy of the Protestant Reformation and the rise of the modern state—the then world of laymen and laywomen, including the institution of the political state, as well as those of commerce and of economic production, had remained subordinated to that of the post-Gregorian Reform Church of Latin-Christian Europe (Le Goff 1983), and therefore to the "rules of the social order" and the theories "which gave them sanction" (See Konrad and Szelenyi guide-quote), as these rules were articulated by its theologians and implemented by its celibate clergy (See Le Goff guide-quote). [End Page 262] The Janus face of the emergence of Mignolo's proposed "modernity/coloniality" complementarity is sited here. As also is the answer to the why of the fact that, as Aníbal Quijano insists in his Qué tal Raza! (2000), the "idea of race" would come to be "the most efficient instrument of social domination invented in the last 500 years." In order for the world of the laity, including that of the then ascendant modern European state, to escape their subordination to the world of the Church, it had been enabled to do so only on the basis of what Michel Foucault identifies as the "invention of Man": that is, by the Renaissance humanists' epochal redescription of the human outside the terms of the then theocentric, "sinful by nature" conception/ "descriptive statement" of the human, on whose basis the hegemony of the Church/clergy over the lay world of Latin-Christian Europe had been supernaturally legitimated (Chorover 1979). While, if this redescription was effected by the lay world's invention of Man as the political subject of the state, in the transumed and reoccupied place of its earlier matrix identity Christian, the performative enactment of this new "descriptive statement" and its master code of symbolic life and death, as the first secular or "degodded" (if, at the time, still only partly so) mode of being human in the history of the species, was to be effected only on the basis of what Quijano identifies as the "coloniality of power," Mignolo as the "colonial difference," and Winant as a huge project demarcating human differences thinkable as a "racial longue durée." One of the major empirical effects of which would be "the rise of Europe" and its construction of the "world civilization" on the one hand, and, on the other, African enslavement, Latin American conquest, and Asian subjugation.

#### The affirmative’s economic engagement with Latin America is just one more manifestation of 500 years of coloniality—the promise of prosperity, democracy, and security is a toxic fantasy that obscures the trail of dead reaching back through time.

Mignolo 05, (Walter, Duke University, “THE IDEA OF LATIN AMERICA”, 2005, 6/28/13|Ashwin)

The logic of coloniality can be understood as working through four wide domains of human experience: (1) the economic: appropriation of land, exploitation of labor, and control of finance; (2) ¶ the political: control of authority; (3) the civic: control of gender and sexuality; (4) the epistemic and the subjective/personal: control ¶ of knowledge and subjectivity. The logic of coloniality has been in ¶ place from the conquest and colonization of Mexico and Peru until ¶ and beyond the war in Iraq, despite superficial changes in the scale ¶ and agents of exploitation/control in the past five hundred years of ¶ history. Each domain is interwoven with the others, since appropriation of land or exploitation of labor also involves the control of ¶ finance, of authority, of gender, and of knowledge and subjectivity.8¶ The operation of the colonial matrix is invisible to distracted eyes, ¶ and even when it surfaces, it is explained through the rhetoric of ¶ modernity that the situation can be “corrected” with “development,” “democracy,” a “strong economy,” etc. What some will see as “lies” ¶ from the US presidential administration are not so much lies as part ¶ of a very well-codified “rhetoric of modernity,” promising salvation ¶ for everybody in order to divert attention from the increasingly ¶ oppressive consequences of the logic of coloniality. To implement ¶ the logic of coloniality requires the celebratory rhetoric of modernity, as the case of Iraq has illustrated from day one. As capital and ¶ power concentrate in fewer and fewer hands and poverty increases ¶ all over the word, the logic of coloniality becomes ever more ¶ oppressive and merciless. Since the sixteenth century, the rhetoric ¶ of modernity has relied on the vocabulary of salvation, which was ¶ accompanied by the massive appropriation of land in the New ¶ World and the massive exploitation of Indian and African slave labor, ¶ justified by a belief in the dispensability of human life – the lives ¶ of the slaves. Thus, while some Christians today, for example, beat ¶ the drum of “pro-life values,” they reproduce a rhetoric that diverts ¶ attention from the increasing “devaluation of human life” that the ¶ thousands dead in Iraq demonstrate. Thus, it is not modernity that will ¶ overcome coloniality, because it is precisely modernity that needs and produces ¶ coloniality.¶ As an illustration, let us follow the genealogy of just the first of ¶ the four domains and see how the logic of coloniality has evolved ¶ in the area of land, labor, and finance. Below I will complement the brief sketch of this first quadrant by going deeper into the fourth ¶ one (knowledge and subjectivity) to show how knowledge transformed Anáhuac and Tawantinsuyu into America and then into ¶ Latin America and, in the process, how new national and subcontinental identities were created. But, first, think of the massive ¶ appropriation of land by the Spanish and Portuguese, the would-be ¶ landlords of the Americas during the sixteenth century, and the same ¶ by the British, French, and Dutch in the extended Caribbean (from ¶ Salvador de Bahia in Brazil to Charleston in today’s South Carolina, ¶ and including the north of Colombia and Venezuela in addition to ¶ the Caribbean islands). The appropriation of land went hand in hand ¶ with the exploitation of labor (Indians and African slaves) and the ¶ control of finance (the accumulation of capital as a consequence of ¶ the appropriation of land and the exploitation of labor). Capital ¶ concentrated in Europe, in the imperial states, and not in the colonies. You can follow this pattern through the nineteenth century ¶ when England and France displaced Spain and Portugal as leading ¶ imperial countries. The logic of coloniality was then reproduced, ¶ and, of course, modified, in the next step of imperial expansion into ¶ Africa and Asia.¶ You can still see the same projects today in the appropriation of ¶ areas of “natural resources” (e.g., in the Amazon or oil-rich Iraq). ¶ Land cannot be reproduced. You can reproduce seeds and other ¶ “products” of land; but land itself is limited, which is another reason ¶ why the appropriation of land is one of the prime targets of capital ¶ accumulation today. The “idea” of Latin America is that of a large ¶ mass of land with a wealth of natural resources and plenty of cheap ¶ labor. That, of course, is the disguised idea. What the rhetoric of ¶ modernity touted by the IMF, the World Bank, and the Washington ¶ consensus would say is that “Latin” America is just waiting for its ¶ turn to “develop.” You could also follow the exploitation of labor ¶ from the Americas to the Industrial Revolution to the movement ¶ of factories from the US to developing nations in order to reduce ¶ costs. As for financial control, just compare the number and size of ¶ banks, for example, in New York, London, or Frankfurt, on the one ¶ hand, versus the ones in Bolivia, Morocco, or India, on the other.¶ Thus, if we consider “America” from the perspective of coloniality (not modernity) and let the Indigenous perspective take center stage, another history becomes apparent. The beginning of the ¶ Zapatista “Manifesto from the Lacandon Jungle” gives us a ¶ blueprint:¶ We are a product of 500 years of struggle: first against slavery, ¶ then during the War of Independence against Spain; then to ¶ avoid being absorbed by North American imperialism, then to ¶ promulgate our constitution and expel the French empire from ¶ our soil; later the dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz denied us the ¶ just application of the Reform laws and the people rebelled ¶ and leaders like Villa and Zapata emerged, poor men just like ¶ us. We have been denied by our rulers the most elemental ¶ conditions of life, so they can use us as cannon fodder and ¶ pillage the wealth of our country. They don’t care that we have ¶ nothing, absolutely nothing, not even a roof over hour heads, ¶ no land, no work, no health care, no food or education. Nor ¶ are we able to freely and democratically elect our political ¶ representatives, nor is there independence from foreigners, nor ¶ is there peace or justice for ourselves and our children.9¶ The “Manifesto from the Lacandon Jungle” precedes a long history ¶ rewritten from an Indigenous perspective (as opposed to the perspective of Mexican Creoles and Mestizos/as or French or US ¶ “experts” on Mexican and “Latin” American history). You may ¶ wonder whether the Indigenous people had a perspective because ¶ you imagine that history is history and what happened just happened, ¶ and argue that there are of course “different interpretations” but ¶ not “different perspectives.” Different interpretations presuppose a ¶ common and shared principle of knowledge and of the rules of the ¶ game, while different perspectives presuppose that the principles of ¶ knowledges and the rules of the game are geo-historically located ¶ in the structure of power of the modern colonial world. To show ¶ how this works, we need something such as “dependency theory” ¶ for the epistemological domain.10 “Dependency theory” showed the ¶ differential of power in the economic domain insofar as it described ¶ a certain structure of differential power in the domain of the ¶ economy. But it also proved the epistemic differential and the distribution of labor within an imperial geo-politics of knowledge in ¶ which political economy moved in one direction: from First to ¶ Third World countries and to contain Second World communism. ¶ In this sense, dependency theory is relevant in changing the geopolitics of knowledge and in pointing toward the need for, and the ¶ possibility of, different locations of understanding and of knowledge ¶ production.¶ The first part of the “Manifesto from the Lacandon Jungle” is a ¶ history and a description of the current economic and social situation in Chiapas, subdivided into the “First Wind” and the “Second ¶ Wind” in emulation of sixteenth-century Spanish chronicles of the ¶ New World. Cast in terms familiar to those conversant with globalization, the first wind is the wind from above and the second that ¶ from below. The declaration, then, outlines the direction of a project ¶ to rewrite the colonial history of modernity from the perspective ¶ of coloniality (instead of writing the history of coloniality from the ¶ perspective of modernity). This framing is subject to questions and ¶ criticisms by critical and inquisitive readers. Professional historians ¶ could argue that there is little historical rigor in this “pamphlet” ¶ and that what we need is serious and rigorous histories of how ¶ things “really” happened. Again, that argument assumes that the ¶ events carry in themselves their own truth and the job of the historian is to discover them. The problem is that “rigorous historiography” is more often than not complicitous with modernity (since ¶ the current conceptualization and practice of historiography, as a ¶ discipline, are a modern rearticulation of a practice dating back to ¶ – again – Greek philosophy). In that respect, the argument for disciplinary rigor turns out to be a maneuver that perpetuates the myth ¶ of modernity as something separate from coloniality. Therefore, if ¶ you happened to be a person educated in the Calmemac in Anáhuac ¶ and were quite far away from the legacies of the Greeks, it would ¶ be your fault for not being aware what civilized history is and how ¶ important it is for you.¶ Other criticisms may stem from the fact that the division of above ¶ and below still originates in the concept of the “above.” Indeed, it ¶ was the Dominican friar Bartolomé de Las Casas who first described ¶ (but did not enact himself ) the perspective now being enacted by ¶ the Zapatistas. The most suspicious reader would add that it is SubComandante Marcos (a Mexican Mestizo who studied at the Universidad Autónoma de México) who narrates. Legitimate ¶ and interesting objections, these. However, such objections remain ¶ entangled in the web and the perspective of modernity; that is, in ¶ the expectations created by the hegemonic perspective of modernity ¶ itself. To unfold this last statement, let’s take another step and perhaps ¶ a detour and come back to the inception of the logic of coloniality ¶ implied in the very idea of both “America” and “Latin” America..4ever

#### The affirmative’s naïve embargo politics proves the productive nature of power – lifting the repressive embargo will not free the Cuban people but will simply provide them with new corporate masters.

Mark 96 Mark, Detroit, Oct. 1, 1996, The imperialist Helms-Burton law and the myth of Cuban socialism, [http://www.communistvoice.org/10cHelms.html]

With Clinton and Congress trying to placate the right-wing on Cuba, another section of bourgeois opinion is critical of this policy and wants an easing of the embargo**.** They do not want the embargo lifted because they are interested in alleviating the suffering of the Cuban masses**.** Rather, they believe that U**.**S**.** imperialism can best push its agenda in Cuba if there is an opening**.** They object to the right-wing bullying on the grounds of expediency**.** They point out that 30-plus years of embargo have not brought down Castro and allow Castro to cement his power by playing on the sentiments of the Cuban masses against arrogant U**.**S**.** threats**.** As well the bourgeois embargo opponents note that there is no viable organized force in Cuba that could presently challenge Castro**.** Thus, they hold that U**.**S**.** interests in Cuba are best served by having U**.**S**.** corporations inside the country, even while Castro is still around**.** They know that U**.**S**.** corporations entering Cuba will be a source of U**.**S**.** political influence there**.** . The bottom line for the bourgeois opponents of the hard-line policy is, well, the bottom line**.** They see the corporations of other countries setting up shop in Cuba and reaching trade deals**.** They worry that the U**.**S**.** companies will be frozen out**.** This view is expressed, for instance, by Wayne S**.** Smith, a prominent bourgeois commentator on Cuba who was U**.**S**.** ambassador there from 1958-61**.** In an article in *Foreign Affairs* of March/April 1996, Smith concludes that the Cuba embargo "complicates relations with America's most important trading partners while denying U**.**S**.** companies any share of the Cuban market**.** The latter is not large, but a recent trade study estimated that the United States and Cuba could quickly be doing some $7 billion a year in business**.**" [(1)](http://www.communistvoice.org/10cHelms.html#N_1_) In another article in the same publication, Pamela S**.** Falk, Staff Director of the U**.**S**.** House of Representatives Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, notes that corporate giants such as GM, Bank of Boston, Sears and major hotel chains have been on scouting expeditions to Cuba**.** AT&T wants to participate in the multi-billion dollar privatization of the Cuban telecommunications system**.** The article quotes the CEO of the Ingersoll-Rand construction corporation stating "The embargo is a waste of taxpayer dollars and time" while his counterpart at Archer Daniels Midland claims not to "know a corporate CEO who thinks excluding U**.**S**.** business is a good idea, particularly when all of Western Europe is down there**.**" [(2)](http://www.communistvoice.org/10cHelms.html#N_2_) . While it is undoubtedly true that many capitalists do not like the present policy on Cuba, it does not automatically follow that the embargo will quickly fall**.** For one thing, the embargo has long had widespread appeal among the U**.**S**.** bourgeoisie overall, which does not trust the Castro government to look after their interests no matter how many concessions it gives to foreign investors**.** For another, there is a question of whether the corporate interest in investing in Cuba is strong enough for them to force the capitalist politicians like Clinton and Dole to forgo political expediency and look "weak on communism"**.** (After all, the bourgeoisie spent decades building up anti-communist hysteria against Cuba**.**) In the case of the huge potential of the China market, the U**.**S**.** bourgeoisie did not allow their usual hysteria against the so-called "communism" there to stop economic relations**.** But the Cuban market does not have anywhere near the same importance to overall U**.**S**.** imperialist interests as does the China market**.** . Of course, the embargo against Cuba is not just opposed by corporations who want to conquer the Cuban market, but by progressive activists who oppose various hardships imposed on the Cuban masses by the embargo and the efforts of the U**.**S**.** to strangle Cuba**.** But it would be a big mistake for activists to think that the lifting of the embargo will solve the main problems of the Cuban masses. This requires not only opposition to U**.**S**.** bullying but opposing the Castro regime and the state-capitalist order in Cuba**.** Indeed, an end to the U.S. embargo means the beginning of the U.S. multinationals sharing in the plunder of the Cuban toilers**.** The anti-embargo section of the U.S**.** of the U**.**S**.** bourgeoisie opposes the pro-embargo section from the standpoint of what policy best serves imperialism**.** Activists who want to stand with the Cuban masses must oppose the embargo as part of a stand against the exploitation of the masses by Cuban state-capitalism and the foreign corporations it welcomes in**.**

#### Inclusionary state practices are inherently violent – their plea to the state becomes fodder to expand the folds of empire, creating more exclusive lines of disposability

Agathangelou et al. 2008 (Anna M. Associate Professor in the Departments of Political Science and Women's Studies at York University, Canada, M. Daniel Bassichis, and Tamara L. Spira, UC President's Postdoctoral Fellow in Cultural Studies at UC Davis, “Intimate Investments:

Homonormativity, Global Lockdown and the Seductions of Empire,” Radical History Review Issue 100 Winter 2008, http://www.makezine.enoughenough.org/intimateinvestments.pdf)

To (re)consolidate itself, empire requires and solicits the production of certain ways of being, desiring, and knowing (while destroying others) that are appropriately malleable for what comes to be constituted as the so-called new world order.12 Just as the strategies of execution and criminalization are crucial to the practices of global war, including prisons, this strategy of creating and liquidating enemies is offered, quite importantly in the wake of trauma, as a solution for fear and insecurity. In other words, as the imperial hold grows all the more tenuous, more and more violence is required to maintain its virulent mirage.13 To deal with pain, fear, and insecurity, this logic tells us, the demonization and demolition of the racially and sexually aberrant other must be performed again and again.14 Moreover, within this imperial fantasy, this production, consumption, and murder of the other is to be performed with gusto and state-sanctioned pleasure, as a desire for witnessing executions becomes a performance of state loyalty.15 Likewise, in the case of prisons, it is the continual and powerful mobilization of discourses of “protection,” “safety,” and “victim’s rights” that elicit support for what seems to be limitless prison expansion.16 Lastly, it is our argument that this promise project is always reliant on a series of (non)promises to those on whom the entire production is staged. Offering certain classes of subjects a tenuous invitation into the folds of empire, there are always the bodies of (non)subjects that serve as the raw material for this process, those whose quotidian deaths become the grounding on which spectacularized murder becomes possible. Thus, while it is central to our thesis that the sexualized production of the racialized other holds together these ostensibly different moments, this is a variegated and heterogeneous process that simultaneously creates others as monolithic and draws up and exacerbates internal divisions within different communities. There are, thus, the “enemy Others” and the “other Others” whose life and death do not even merit mention or attention.17 Importantly, as we shall argue, we must locate what many have called “the homonormative turn” within this broader (heterogeneous) imperial logic: following the traumas of state-sanctioned repression of queer communities, the creation and obliteration of new outsides become the answer for ongoing pain and devastation. As exemplified in the U.S. state-supported HIV/AIDS pandemic—and the broader war on the poor, people of color, and dissidents launched in the wake of the radical social movements of the 1960s and 1970s—we are told that only an insatiable appetite for annihilation could soothe the pains of our pasts. We would thus locate the mobilization of highly individualized narratives of bourgeois belonging and ascension within a larger promise project that offers to some the tenuous promise of mobility, freedom, and equality.18 This strategy is picked up in a privatized, corporatized, and sanitized “gay agenda” that places, for example, gay marriage and penalty-enhancing hate crimes laws at the top of its priorities. This also helps us to understand the ways in which revolutionary and redistributive yearnings that would challenge the foundations of the U.S. state, capital, and racial relations have been systematically replaced with strategies for individualized incorporation into the U.S. moral and politico-economic order. It is this promise project that has been crucial in rerouting so much of queer politics and longing from “Stonewall to the suburbs.”19

#### Coloniality naturalizes a non-ethics of death and generalizes the condition of damnation—ongoing genocide, enslavement, rape, ecological destruction and unending war is produced by and reproduces colonial epistmeologies.

Maldonado-Torres 08 [Nelson. “Against War : Views from the Underside of Modernity”¶ Durham, NC, USA: Duke University Press, 2008. p 215-217¶ http://site.ebrary.com/lib/utexas/Doc?id=10217191&ppg=52]

Dussel, Quijano, and Wynter lead us to the understanding that what happened in the Americas was a transformation and naturalization of the non-ethics of war— which represented a sort of exception to the ethics that regulate normal conduct in Christian countries— into a more stable and long-standing reality of damnation, and that this epistemic and material shift occurred in the colony. Damnation, life in hell, is colonialism: a reality characterized by the naturalization of war by means of the naturalization of slavery, now justified in relation to the very constitution of people and no longer solely or principally to their faith or belief. That human beings become slaves when they are vanquished in a war translates in the Americas into the suspicion that the conquered people, and then non-European peoples in general, are constitutively inferior and that therefore they should assume a position of slavery and serfdom. Later on, this idea would be solidified with respect to the slavery of African peoples, achieving stability up to the present with the tragic reality of different forms of racism. Through this process, what looked like a “state of exception” in the colonies became the rule in the modern world. However, deviating from Giorgio Agamben’s diagnosis, one must say that the colony— long before the concentration camp and the Nazi politics of extermination— served as the testing ground for the limits and possibilities of modernity, thereby revealing its darkest secrets.61 It is race, the coloniality of power, and its concomitant Eurocentrism (and¶ not only national socialisms or expressed forms of fascism) that allow the “state of exception” to continue to define ordinary relations in this, our so-called postmodern world. Race emerges within a permanent state of exception where forms of behavior that are legitimate in war become a natural part of the ordinary way of life. In that world, an otherwise extraordinary affair becomes the norm and living in it requires extraordinary effort.62 In the racial/ colonial world, the “hell” of war becomes a condition that defines the reality of racialized selves, which Fanon referred to as the damnés de la terre (condemned of the earth). The damné (condemned) is a subject who exists in a permanent “hell,” and as such, this figure serves as the main referent or liminal other that guarantees the continued affirmation of modernity as a paradigm of war. The hell of the condemned is not defined by the alienation of colonized productive forces, but rather signals the dispensability of racialized subjects, that is, the idea that the world would be fundamentally better without them. The racialized subject is ultimately a dispensable source of value, and exploitation is conceived in this context as due torture, and not solely as the extraction of surplus value. Moreover, it is this very same conception that gives rise to the particular erotic dynamics that characterize the relation between the master and its slaves or racialized workers. The condemned, in short, inhabit a context in which the confrontation with death and murder is ordinary. Their “hell” is not simply “other people,” as Sartre would have put it— at least at one point— but rather racist perceptions that are responsible for the suspension of ethical behavior toward peoples at the bottom of the color line. Through racial conceptions that became central to the modern self, modernity and coloniality produced a permanent state of war that racialized and colonized subjects cannot evade or escape. The modern function of race and the coloniality of power, I am suggesting here, can be understood as a radicalization and naturalization of the non-ethics of war in colonialism.63 This non-ethics included the practices of eliminating and enslaving certain subjects— for example, indigenous and black— as part of the enterprise of colonization. From here one could as well refer to them as the death ethics of war. War, however, is not only about killing or enslaving; it also includes a particular treatment of sexuality and femininity: rape. Coloniality is an order of things that places people of color within the murderous and rapist view of a vigilant ego, and the primary targets of this rape are women. But men of color are also seen through these lenses and feminized, to become fundamentally penetrable subjects for the ego conquiro. Racialization functions through gender and sex, and the ego conquiro is thereby constitutively a phallic ego as well.64 Dussel, who presents this thesis of the phallic character of the ego cogito, also makes links, albeit indirectly, with the reality of war. And thus, in the beginning of modernity, before Descartes discovered . . . a terrifying anthropological dualism in Europe, the Spanish conquistadors arrived in America. The phallic conception of the European-medieval world is now added to the forms of submission of the vanquished Indians. “Males,” Bartolomé de las Casas writes, are reduced through “the hardest, most horrible, and harshest serfdom”; but this only occurs with those who have remained alive, because many of them have died; however, “in war typically they only leave alive young men (mozos) and women.”65 The indigenous people who survive the massacre or are left alive have to contend with a world that considers them to be dispensable. And since their bodies have been conceived of as inherently inferior or violent, they must be constantly subdued or civilized, which requires renewed acts of conquest and colonization. The survivors continue to live in a world defined by war, and this situation is peculiar in the case of women. As T. Denean Sharpley-Whiting and Renée T. White put it in the preface to their anthology Spoils of War: Women of Color, Cultures, and Revolutions: A sexist and/or racist patriarchal culture and order posts and attempts to maintain, through violent acts of force if necessary, the subjugation and inferiority of women of color. As Joy James notes, “its explicit, general premise constructs a conceptual framework of male [and/or white] as normative in order to enforce a political [racial, economic, cultural, sexual] and intellectual mandate of male [and/or white] as superior.” The warfront has always been a “feminized” and “colored” space for women of color. Their experiences and perceptions of war, conflict, resistance, and struggle emerge from their specific racial-ethnic and gendered locations. “Inter arma silent leges: in time of war the law is silent,” Walzer notes. Thus, this volume operates from the premise that war has been and is presently in our midst.66 The links between war, conquest, and the exploitation of women’s bodies are hardly accidental. In his study of war and gender, Joshua Goldstein argues that conquest usually proceeds through an extension of the rape and exploitation of women in wartime.67 He argues that to understand conquest, one needs to examine: 1) male sexuality as a cause of aggression; 2) the feminization of enemies as symbolic domination; and 3) dependence on the exploitation of women’s labor— including reproduction.68 My argument is, first, that these three elements came together in a powerful way in the idea of race that began to emerge in the conquest and colonization of the Americas. My second point is that through the idea of race, these elements exceed the activity of conquest and come to define what from that point on passes as the idea of a “normal” world. As a result, the phenomenology of a racial context resembles, if it is not fundamentally identical to, the phenomenology of war and conquest. Racism posits its targets as racialized and sexualized subjects that, once vanquished, are said to be inherently servile and whose bodies come to form part of an economy of sexual abuse, exploitation, and control. The coloniality of power cannot be fully understood without reference to the transformation and naturalization of war and conquest in modern times. Hellish existence in the colonial world carries with it both the racial and the gendered aspects of the naturalization of the non-ethics of war. “Killability” and “rapeability” are inscribed into the images of colonial bodies and deeply mark their ordinary existence. Lacking real authority, colonized men are permanently feminized and simultaneously represent a constant threat for whom any amount of authority, any visible trace of the phallus is multiplied in a symbolic hysteria that knows no limits.69 Mythical depiction of the black man’s penis is a case in point: the black man is depicted as an aggressive sexual beast who desires to rape women, particularly white women. The black woman, in turn, is seen as always already sexually available to the rapist gaze of the white, and as fundamentally promiscuous. In short, the black woman is seen as a highly erotic being whose primary function is fulfilling sexual desire and reproduction. To be sure, any amount of “penis” in either one represents a threat, but in his most familiar and typical forms the black man represents the act of rape—“raping”—while the black woman is seen as the most legitimate victim of rape—“being raped.” In an antiblack world black women appear as subjects who deserve to be raped and to suffer the consequences— in terms of a lack of protection from the legal system, sexual abuse, and lack of financial assistance to sustain themselves and their families— just as black men deserve to be penalized for raping, even without having committed the act. Both “raping” and “being raped” are attached to blackness as if they form part of the essence of black folk, who are seen as a dispensable population. Black bodies are seen as excessively violent and erotic, as well as being the legitimate recipients of excessive violence, erotic and otherwise.70 “Killability” and “rapeability” are part of their essence, understood in a phenomenological way. The “essence” of blackness in a colonial anti-black world is part of a larger context of meaning in which the death ethics of war gradually becomes a constitutive part of an allegedly normal world. In its modern racial and colonial connotations and uses, blackness is the invention and the projection of a social body oriented by the death ethics of war.71 This murderous and raping social body projects the features that define it onto sub-Others in order to be able to legitimate the same behavior that is allegedly descriptive of them. The same ideas that inspire perverted acts in war— particularly slavery, murder, and rape— are legitimized in modernity through the idea of race and gradually come to be seen as more or less normal thanks to the alleged obviousness and non-problematic character of black slavery and anti-black racism. To be sure, those who suffer the consequences of such a system are primarily blacks and indigenous peoples, but it also deeply affects all of those who appear as colored or close to darkness. In short, this system of symbolic representations, the material conditions that in part produce and continue to legitimate it, and the existential dynamics that occur therein (which are also at the same time derivative and constitutive of such a context) are part of a process that naturalizes the non-ethics or death ethics of war. Sub-ontological difference is the result of such naturalization and is legitimized through the idea of race. In such a world, ontology collapses into a Manicheanism, as Fanon suggested.72

#### The alternative is the DEATH OF THE AMERICAN MAN – this is an epistemological and semiotic struggle to deflate the enthno-class of Man

Maldonado Torres 05 [Nelson, professor at Rutgers, “Decolonization and the New Identitarian Logics after September 11,” Radical Philosophy Review 8, n. 1 (2005): 35-67]

Inspired by these Fanonian insights l have articulated elsewhere the idea of a weak utopian project as bringing about the Death of European Man.67 I think that the peculiar intricacies between "estadounidense" patriotism, Eurocentrism, the propensity to war, and the continued subordination of the theoretical contributions of peoples from the south call for a reformulation of this idea.68 Today, after the post- 1989 and post-September 11 patriotism we shall call more directly simply for the Death of American Man.6 By American Man I mean a concept or figure, a particular way of being-in-the-world, the very subject of an episteme that gives continuity to an imperial order of things under the rubrics of liberty and the idea of a Manifest Destiny that needs to be accomplished. American Man and its predecessor and still companion European Man are unified under an even more abstract concept, Imperial Man. Imperial gestures and types of behavior are certainly not unique to Europe or "America." A radical critique and denunciation of Latin American Man, and of ethno-class continental Man in general, is what 1 aim at in my critique. "Man," here, refers to an ideal of humanity, and not to concrete human beings. It is that ideal which must die in order for the human to be born. ¶ It should be clear that what I call for and defend here is epistemological and semiotic struggle, which takes the form of critical analysis and the invention and shar­ing of ideas that allow humans to preserve their humanity. A subversive act is that which helps us to deflate imperial and continental concepts of Man, such as referring to "Americans" in a way that designates their own particular provinciality rather than by a concept through which they appropriate the whole extent of the so-called "New World." Popular culture in the u\_s. has picked up on many Spanish words and phrases (such as "Ay Caramba,.. "Hasta Ia vista, baby," and several others), but "" has failed to adopt the central one (perhaps because Latin@s have not insisted on it enough): "estadounidense." "Estadounidense" is one of the most important words that U.S. Americans learn from Spanish. It could be considered one of the most precious gifts (not an imperial but a decolonial one) from Spanish and Hispanic culture to the Anglo-Saxon Protestant culture that Huntington reifies and s e e k s to protect. As I have argued elsewhere, unfortunately, reception of gifts and hospitality are two fundamental modes of humanity that those who occupy and assume the position of Master most resist. Indeed, the reception or resistance of decolonizing gifts provides a measure of the presence of coloniality.¶Before being a challenge, Latin@s in this country have been colonized and ra­ cialized subjects as well as collaborators in different forms of racialization. Many Latin@s, especially conservative ones, desire the American and Americano Dream­ most often they desire it until they realize that it turns into a nightmare, both for oth­ ers and for themselves. While the culturalist-nationalist response to the Americana Dream consists in taking away the possibility of dreaming this dream in Spanish, a decolonial response rather abandons the very idea of the American or Americana Dream and offers as a gift the possibility for the Anglo-Saxon U . S . American to dream the "estadounidense" dream-a dream that does not have anything to do about speaking one language or another, but about learning from others basic ideas about how to conceive of oneself, in this case, to see oneself as a nation-in-relation rather than as a continental being.71

#### And we must decolonize debate practice itself—Education based on Western epistemologies continue forms of colonial schooling designed to reproduce coloniality- from the “moral project” of educating and civilizing the Indians to teaching of social Darwinism in the Congo. Decolonizing education requires not only an analysis of the knowledge, power, Eurocentrism, colonial history, and political economy inherent in educational activities like debate but also foregrounding the possibility of epistemic resistance.

Shahjahan 11 [Riyad Ahmed, Assistant Professor of Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education (HALE) at Michigan State University. Ph.D. at the OISE/University of Toronto in Higher Education. “Decolonizing the evidence-based education and policy movement:¶ revealing the colonial vestiges in educational policy, research, and¶ neoliberal reform” Online publication date: 22 March 201, Journal of Education Policy, 26: 2,¶ 181 — 206 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2010.508176>]

Revisiting histories of colonial educational policy in schooling helps us contextualize¶ and demonstrate how evidence-based education, tied to high-stakes testing and¶ neoliberalism, reproduces past colonial ideologies with respect to developing colonized¶ labor. Throughout European colonialism, schooling was not only used to colonize¶ the minds to force cultural assimilation or acceptance of colonial rule, but also to¶ produce a reservoir of subservient labor that would harvest and mine commodities for¶ the imperial economy. For instance, in North America, colonial schooling ‘introduced¶ the concept of forced labor as part of Indian education, transforming the ostensibly¶ “moral project” of civilizing Indians into a for-profit enterprise’ (Grande 2004, 13). In¶ boarding schools, part of the most important feature of the colonialist curriculum ‘was¶ the inculcation of the industrial or “Protestant” work ethic’ (13). In the Belgian¶ Congo, Darwin’s scientific racism was the dominant discourse among Belgian colonizers,¶ and it influenced their colonial educational policy. For the Belgian government¶ and leaders of industry, the Congolese was to learn in school a work ethos that clearly¶ catered to the economic endeavor, and to mold the Congolese playfulness and laziness¶ into a life of ‘progress,’ order and discipline (Seghers 2004, 465). In Hawaii, colonial¶ schools ‘became less a means of religious conversion and more a site for socializing¶ Hawaiian and immigrant children for work on the plantation’ (Kaomea 2000, 322). In¶ Africa in general, Urch notes: The demand for skilled native labor by the white settlers and commercial leaders caused¶ the colonial administrators to reevaluate the educational program of the missions.¶ Education solely for proselytization was not considered sufficient to enable the colonies’¶ economy to expand. Government officials saw the need for an educational process that¶ would help to break down tribal solidarity and force the African into a money economy.¶ (1971, 252)¶ In short, colonial schooling played a significant role in disciplining the minds and¶ bodies of the colonized for imperial profit.¶ Interestingly, when it came to ‘pillars of the curriculum,’ what was common¶ among many colonial environments, ‘were religion and the legendary “3Rs”¶ [Reading, (W)riting and “Rithmetic”]’ (Sjöström 2001, 79). These pillars of the¶ curriculum very much parallel, with a slight change, the curriculum that is tested via¶ PISA and TIMSS which concentrates on reading, math, and science. In the contemporary¶ context, science has replaced the pillar of religion in the curriculum. Also, in the¶ present context, the neoliberal economy has replaced the old imperial economy, but¶ the objective for schooling still stays the same, which is to produce a labor force for¶ the global economy. As Lipman points out, these accountability reforms ‘certify that¶ students that graduate from’ schooling ‘will have [the] basic literacies and disciplined¶ dispositions’ needed for a global workforce (2003, 340). International organizations¶ such as the OECD and the World Bank, have replaced the old adage ‘protestant work¶ ethic’ of colonial schooling, with the knowledge and skills to function in the knowledge¶ economy, such as literacy to manipulate information, problem solving, math, and¶ science (Spring 2009). In other words, like colonial schooling, education via neoliberal¶ reform is working towards reproducing a labor force and objectification of the¶ colonized. Ceasire’s argument of ‘thingification’ fits very well with the colonizing of¶ bodies in neoliberal educational reform. Teachers, students, and education in general¶ are all objectified and reduced to commodities to serve the global economy. To this¶ end, Lipman states: Students are reduced to test scores, future slots in the labor market, prison numbers, and¶ possible cannon fodder in military conquests. Teachers are reduced to technicians and¶ supervisors in the education assembly line – ‘objects’ rather than ‘subjects’ of history.¶ This system is fundamentally about the negation of human agency, despite the good¶ intentions of individuals at all levels. (2004, 179)¶ Global colonialism continues with the evidence-based education movement, as education¶ is increasingly reduced into standardized packages that can be sold in the global¶ marketplace, while at the same time promoting a system of education that is focused¶ on training a skilled workforce that will operate in the global labor market (Lipman¶ 2004; Berry 2008; Spring 2009; Rizvi and Lingard 2010). To this end, Fanon states:¶ I came into the world imbued with the will to find a meaning in things, my spirit filled¶ with the desire to attain to the source of the world, and then I found that I was an object¶ in the midst of other objects. (1967, 109).¶ The desires and agencies of many teachers, students, and educational leaders are being¶ stripped away, while at the same time they are turned into ‘an object in the midst of¶ other objects’ through the neoliberal logic of evidence-based education. In summary,¶ the neoliberal agenda, currently dominant in education systems around the world, reproduces¶ colonial educational policies. Within the evidence-based education movement, the epistemic and material are not separate but are intertwined in colonial discourse¶ and history. As this section demonstrates, evidence-based education not only colonizes¶ education epistemologically, but also perpetuates materialist power relations and¶ disciplines bodies of the colonized to serve the global economy.¶Concluding remarks and implications¶ [U]nless educational reform happens concurrently with analysis of the forces of colonialism,¶ it can only serve as a insufficient Band-aid over the incessant wound of imperialism.¶ (Grande 2004, 19)¶ Grande eloquently summarizes the intention behind this article, which is to offer a¶ conceptual map linking events of the colonial past with a present movement that¶ continues to perpetuate colonial discourses and practices within educational policy.¶ My hope is that the analysis presented in this paper provides an alteration in terms on¶ what is unsaid or left out in educational policy and bolsters a critical analysis of power¶ in educational policy. I argue in this paper that the evidence-based education movement¶ is very much tied to multiple colonial discourses, which can be traced back to a¶ colonial history that has simply been ignored in the literature. In other words, this article¶ challenges us to move beyond the confines of Eurocentrism and historical amnesia¶ to critically examine evidence-based education and to contextualize this movement¶ within colonial discourses and histories. It is my hope that this article demonstrates the usefulness of the anticolonial lens¶ in examining educational policy. This framework foregrounds the intersections¶ between knowledge, power, Eurocentrism, colonial history, and political economy, in¶ educational policy. The epistemic, cultural, and material perspectives in anticolonial¶ thought are applicable to policy analysis. This is evident in the way that ‘educational¶ research,’ ‘evidence,’ ‘curriculum,’ and ‘learning outcomes’ are being defined and¶ re-imagined in evidence-based education, as these are ultimately shaped by material¶ relations of power that are colonizing. For instance, common to any colonial¶ discourse is the rationale for purifying administration in the name of efficiency, and a¶ binaristic civilizing narrative is used in this regard. By naming and representing¶ education as a field in chaos, evidence-based education proponents, with good intentions,¶ are justifying actions and measures to make education systems more evidencebased¶ and in turn standardize and rationalize complex educational processes. As this¶ paper demonstrates, many proponents of evidence-based education profess an¶ educational policy with the intention of improving learning for all students (which¶ may be their full intent), but their discourse continues to perpetuate colonized power¶ relationships. In other words, they are unknowingly striving to control and ‘tame’¶ education through evidence-based education. An anticolonial lens also reminds us how social hierarchies and knowledge¶ systems were used to justify colonial interventions with the objective of reshaping¶ society in order to exploit the labor and material resources of the colonized, and allow¶ for certain power relations to be legitimized. In the evidence-based education movement,¶ we see the mobilization of colonial discourse with regard to the way ‘evidence’¶ and ‘learning’ is being constructed and used to purify the production of knowledge to¶ meet neoliberal ends of education. Furthermore, the anticolonial lens reveals the¶ commodification, objectification, and dehumanization of bodies and knowledge¶ systems in colonial processes. This article demonstrates how this ‘thingification’ occurs in evidence-based education for teachers, students, and educational leaders. An¶ anticolonial lens cannot separate the political economy from the epistemic issues. To¶ this end, this paper demonstrates how evidence-based education is part of a neoliberal¶ agenda which is also tied to global colonialism and the production of colonized labor.¶ In short, an anticolonial lens helps to bring forward the social–historical–political¶ processes that stem from colonial relations of power and informs contemporary¶ knowledge production, validation, and dissemination in educational policy. An anticolonial lens also stresses that colonial discourses and material relations of¶ power are not absolute, and that the colonized also have discursive and material¶ agency. To this end, one of the limitations of my analysis is that it overlooks the¶ agency among the colonized, and has presented evidence-based education as a monolithic¶ discourse with homogenizing effects, rather than a partial discourse that is¶ contested and lived differently from its intentions. Historically, and in present¶ contexts, imperialism and colonialism were never monolithic or unidirectional, and¶ the boundaries between colonizers and colonized were not clearly demarcated (see¶ Cooper and Stoler 1997; Young 2001; Bush 2006). Similarly, evidence-based education¶ is not an absolute, unidirectional discourse. From an anticolonial lens, we need to¶ look for those sites of resistance and discrepancies to highlight the limitations/¶ inequities of evidence-based education and bring those struggles to the foreground. To¶ this end, I will now discuss some examples of the ‘tensions’ and resistances to¶ evidence-based education. For instance, in Canada, the British Columbia Teacher’s¶ Federation has led a campaign to resist the Foundations Skills Assessment instituted¶ by the provincial government (http://www.bctf.ca/fsa.aspx). In Ontario, African-¶ Canadian parents are frustrated with the Toronto public schooling system failing to¶ respond to the needs of Black youth and are demanding Africentric schools from the¶ Toronto District School Board (Adjei and Agyepong 2009). In the USA, Fine et al.¶ (2007) describe, how schools, communities, parents, and grandparents are engaged in¶ active resistance to such accountability measures and schooling. Chicago residents of¶ Little Village have launched an organizing campaign for a local high school dedicated¶ to culture, community, and activism, which culminated in a 19-day hunger strike by¶ Latino high school students, educators, community organizers, residents, and even¶ grandmothers. Similarly, in a California community, largely populated by migrant¶ families, the school district, joined by nine other districts and civil rights organizations,¶ sued the state over the improper use of English-language assessments to test¶ English Language Learners and the sanctions they face under NCLB (Fine et al.¶ 2007). Teachers also have the agency to interpret, disseminate, and act on the information¶ based on such accountability policies (Lipman 2002; Ball 2003; Sloan 2007). Some¶ teachers have left the profession as an act of resistance because these accountability¶ trends no longer reflect their critical educational philosophy (McNeil 2000; Lipman¶ 2002; Ball 2003). Other teachers enact resistance by subverting the official test-based¶ curriculum. For instance, as one Chicago school teacher put it:¶ I think that we are having a rough time, that sometimes we may lean a little bit more¶ towards CPS policies and other times we lean a little bit more to ‘screw CPS’ and focus¶ on critical thinking skills. (Lipman 2002, 392)¶ Some still display ambivalence towards teaching for the test for the purpose of¶ surveillance: I have mixed feelings about it … I think it’s how we interpret the results. If we use it to¶ say our school is better than yours, then I don’t want to do it. If we use it so that we can¶ help the teachers program better for the kids, then that is more useful as a tool. (Canadian¶ Grade 3 teacher, cited in Childs and Fung 2009, 9)¶ In short, teachers, students, parents, families, and community activists have demonstrated¶ the agency to negotiate and contest these colonial discourses in every day¶ practice. Accountability reforms, tied with evidence-based education, depending on¶ context, have also had multiple effects on schools and curricula, and also have critics¶ from within. Scholars have noted how the colonizing effects of accountability reform¶ on schooling and resistance to these reforms depend on the context and the questions¶ of race, class, language, and localized policies (Lipman 2002, 2003; Earl and Fullan¶ 2003; Maxcy 2006). For instance, in her study on the impact of accountability reform¶ for four Chicago schools, Lipman notes how these ‘schools’ responses to accountability¶ are closely linked to past and present race and class advantages, the relative political¶ power of their communities, and new forms of racialization’ (2003, 338).¶ Moreover, in a significant minority of cases, high-stakes testing has led to curricular¶ content expansion, the integration of knowledge, and more student-centered, cooperative¶ pedagogies, such as in secondary social studies and language arts (Au 2007).¶ Hence, the nature of high-stakes-test-induced curricular control is highly dependent¶ on the structures of the tests themselves (Au 2007). In summary, high-stakes testing¶ does not produce a monolithic effect, but has heterogeneous results depending on¶ questions of social difference and context. Furthermore, proponents of evidence-based¶ education ‘are not monolithic and that at least some of them are open to dialog on the¶ issues on which we disagree’ (Maxwell 2004, 39). In short, an acknowledgment of the¶ colonial historical legacy of the evidence-based education movement may help us¶ move beyond a discourse of sameness in colonial discourse, and start thinking about¶ the possibilities, interruptions, contestations, and resistances to the colonizing effects¶ of evidence-based education. Recently, there has been growing ethnographic studies¶ that examine such sites of resistance and contradictions at the ground level. These¶ spaces are where future studies and dialog could focus their attention. In terms of policy and educational practice, an anticolonial lens motivates us to ask¶ a different set of questions and re-imagine educational research, practice, and policy.¶ For instance, what is being left out in the discussion of evidence-based education¶ movement is the glaring systemic inequities that are privileging some bodies¶ (students, teachers, and administrators) and knowledge systems (language, curricula,¶ and culture) over others (see McNeil 2000; Lipman 2004; Valuenzela 2005; Maxcy¶ 2006), that are tied to the global economy (Stewart-Harawira 2005). Rather than blaming¶ students, teachers, and administrators for progress in public tests, and working¶ from a deficit model, we need to shift our attention towards deploying significant¶ material and intellectual resources to serve diverse needs and minoritized bodies¶ (Lipman 2002, 2003), and challenge global economic systems. Furthermore, instead¶ of looking for the pitfalls of educational practice, we could ask and explore the following¶ questions (see Asa Hilliard cited in Lemons-Smith 2008; Hood and Hopson 2008):¶ How does academic excellence flourish in schools attended mostly by minoritized¶ students? How do teachers who reject the status quo and define excellence as responding¶ to community needs, find ways to promote excellence for all students regardless¶ of their circumstances? ‘Student achievement at what cost’ [Michael Dantley, personal communication]? What ideological paradigms underlie teacher education?¶ What is the role of teacher preparation programs in perpetuating and promoting these¶ values of equity and social justice?¶ Finally, in terms of educational policy, we may ask: whose cultural assumptions¶ and histories inform such accountability systems, ‘evidence,’ ‘data,’ and ‘learning¶ outcomes?’ ‘Whose notions of evidence matter most? And to whom does evidence¶ matter most?’ (Hood and Hopson 2008, 418). According to Stanfield (1999) and¶ Gillborn (2005), educational policy and research continue to impose the standards and¶ products of White supremacy on the racially minoritized. As Stanfield states:¶ Implicit White supremacy norms and values contribute … to Eurocentric concepts and¶ measurement epistemologies, techniques, and interpretations … Concretely, in the¶ United States and elsewhere in the West, … it has been considered normative to consider¶ Eurocentric notions and experiences as the baseline, as the yardstick to compare and¶ contrast the notions and experiences of people of color. This is … most apparent in¶ designing, implementing, and interpreting standardized tests and survey instruments.¶ (1999, 421)¶ I would argue that we need to ‘reappropriate’ evidence-based education to include a¶ broader array of evidence, experiences, and cultural knowledges (Luke 2003, 98; see¶ also Stanfield 1999; Valuenzela, Prieto, and Hamilton 2007). Finally, borrowing the¶ words of Asa Hilliard III, we need to ask, ‘do we have the will to educate all children’¶ (cited in Lemons-Smith 2008, 908), to respond to the needs, survival, self-determination,¶ and sovereignty of their respective communities and the planet? (see also Dei 2000;¶ Grande 2004). In an era of transnational capital, where ‘[g]lobalized discourses and agendasetting¶ and policy pressures now emerge from beyond the nation’(Rizvi and Lingard¶ 2010, 14–15), we need to have transnational dialogs (Mohanty 2003) on the impact of¶ evidence-based education and neoliberal reform across borders and social institutions.¶ This is because such transnational alliances and solidarity are needed to contest global¶ forces informed by transnational corporations as well as international organizations¶ such as the World Bank and OECD. What is noteworthy and rarely discussed, are the¶ similarities and differences in the discourses and effects of evidence-based education¶ movement across the three nation-states analyzed in this paper. Future research could¶ speculate and study how these ideas of evidence-based education circulate and move¶ across borders (see Rizvi and Lingard 2010).¶ Finally, as someone who has had the privilege to teach research methodology to¶ graduate students (including teachers, teacher educators, principals, and superintendents),¶ I am alarmed by how many of my students grumble about standardized testing,¶ and some even focus their research on such topics. What is also disconcerting is how¶ many of my students have a hard time imagining research and evidence that go¶ beyond numbers because of the ‘numbers game’ they must play in their daily working¶ lives. These trends are not a reflection of my students’ inabilities to see beyond¶ numbers, but a testament to the hegemony of the structural environment that reminds¶ them of what constitutes valid knowledge every day. Also of great concern is the¶ speed at which educational leaders, students, and teachers are being rushed through¶ standardized processes that leave little time for reflection, authenticity, and healing.¶ Many of my students have shared these accounts in my classroom, with me in person,¶ and in their reflection papers. For instance, one student who is currently a high school¶ teacher commented in a recent email: ‘The standards and objectives themselves work to eliminate any third space or anticolonial space. We read, write, process for the sole¶ purpose of testing and not for liberation.’¶ In this regard, I propose that we need to ‘slow down’ in educational practice and¶ policy. To this end, I am reminded of the words of Malidoma Some, an African Shaman¶ healer, who stated ‘while that the indigenous world looks, the industrial world over¶ looks’ (emphasis added). Educators, teachers, students, and policy-makers need time,¶ not to be given more information for decision-making or learning, but more importantly¶ to assess what we are overlooking in educating future generations. For instance, we¶ need more time to come together, dialog, heal, build reciprocity, understand difference,¶ and re-imagine educational policy and practice for the benefit of future generations. It¶ is only by slowing down that we will realize that our students, educational researchers,¶ teachers, and administrators are not ‘uncultivated soil,’ in the words of La Casas, but¶ rather seeds with the power within to germinate on their own if they are provided the¶ freedom, resources, and time. Slowing down is what I believe decolonizing education¶ means in this era of neoliberal policies and transnational capital!

## Neolib

#### The alt challenges the metaphor of Cuba better, we fully reject the American ethno-class while the aff holds onto the capitalist ideologies of the west

**Neoliberals will use economic engagement as a tool to push capitalism on to Cuba**

**Wenston & Woods ‘08**

(Fred & Alan, Alan Woods is a Trotskyist political theorist and author. He is one of the leading members of the International Marxist Tendency, as well as its British affiliate group Socialist Appeal, [Vultures hovering over Cuba after Fidel Castro steps down](http://www.cjournal.info/2008/02/20/vultures-hovering-over-cuba-after-fidel-castro-steps-down/) http://www.cjournal.info/2008/02/20/vultures-hovering-over-cuba-after-fidel-castro-steps-down/)

**They all pretend to be democrats when it comes to Cuba. In reality they are like vultures waiting for the day they can get their beaks and claws into the flesh of Cuba. What they are after is the end of the economic system brought into being by the Cuban revolution. They want capitalism to return to Cuba.** That is what they mean by “democracy”! **Another fashionable term these days is “engagement”.** While Bush sticks to his guns and insists on the embargo being **stepped up, the more intelligent bourgeois, both in the USA and Europe are raising the need for “engagement”, i.e. on removing the embargo and opening up trade channels. Does this wing of the bourgeois have different interests or aims? No, they simply understand better than Bush and his obtuse circle of friends that the best way to re-introduce capitalism into Cuba is to lift the embargo, begin trading, flood Cuba with cash and let the process unfold.**¶ That is why it is even more disgusting when we hear some reformist elements on the left advocating such “engagement”. What they are actually doing is giving the bourgeois advice on how to remove this thorn in their side.¶ **All this talk of democracy is in fact a cover for the real aims of imperialism.** Not so long ago the Financial Times was giving more sober advice. They were suggesting a “Chinese road” for Cuba accompanied by a lifting of the US-sponsored embargo. The Chinese model would envisage an opening up of Cuba to capitalism accompanied by a firm grip on state power at the top.

#### Their Shreve evidence concedes that Cuba would be forced to assimilate their economic policies if it were to globalize, kills their anti-neoliberal resistance

**Maintaining the embargo is preferable to the influx of Us neoliberalism – their impact claims are built on ideological lies.**

**Malott No date but it is after 2005,**

(Curry Malott teaches at D’Youville College, NY, “Cuban education in Neo – Liberal times: Social revolution and state capitalism, I don’t know the other information since I wasn’t the one who got this online)

**It can hardly be denied that Cuba’s achievements, most notably in the areas of education and health care, have been a fundamental source of Cuban pride and support for their government**, despite the poverty suffered by most Cubans, which has largely been explained is the result of external factors, as noted above. Cubans do not necessarily have to believe Castro (1999) that neo-liberal global capitalists enter “third world” areas with tremendous tax breaks and ‘ ... pay not more than 5 percent of the salary they must pay in their own countries ... ” leaving behind nothing more than pollution, poverty and “meager wages” (p. 13), all they have to do, as many do, is look at their neighboring countries to realize that **life dominated by the insatiable appetite for profits and personal gain of neo-liberal capitalism would have far graver consequences on their lives than the US Embargo. For example, it is widely believed by Cubans that privatization would almost instantly lead to illiteracy and a spike in infant mortality rates** (Báez, 2004).¶ However, Báez (2004) and other activist scholars are watching closely wondering if the pride of The Revolution will eventually attract investment offers too good to turn down given the economic hardships endured by the Cuban people as a result of US economic warfare/terrorism coupled with the end of Soviet aid. **Indeed, it has been noted on more than one occasion that the Cuban people comprise the best-educated¶ and healthiest populations in Latin America increasing their value as a commodity on the international market. Castro (1999) takes special care to note that even during Cuba’s most financially desperate times, funding for their education and health care programs were never cut, and gains in the health of the population were even realized.** However, because the state maintains high levels of education as a basic right, and because the economy is set up around an externally controlled global market system based on the manufacture of scarcity, the level of education among the population tends to exceed that which is needed in employment. It is within this context of real material desperation among Cubans, in a context of manufactured scarcity and marked by the fall of the USSR and appropriately dubbed the “Special Period,” that we can begin to understand Cuba’s economic reform policies that have re-privatized certain segments of the Cuban economy, such as tourism, when Castro himself has spent the majority of his time in office as a staunch opponent of private capitalism. **For example, expressing his indignation at the dehumanizing and destructive nature of capitalism Castro (1999) laments, “ ... neo-liberal globalization wants to turn all countries ... into private property ... into a huge free trade zone” (p. 13).** But what role has the Cuban government and Castro himself played in turning their country into a free trade zone in their engagements with private capitalists? **After the revolution the Cuban people, inspired by Castro’s moving speeches tapping into the populations’ patriotism and legacy of imperial resistance, were enthusiastically energized to work in the sugar cane fields striving to produce record breaking yields in order to support the pillars of the revolution, such as education, for the emergence of what Ernesto “Che” Guevara called the “new man,”** which has been criticized for embracing traditional masculine values within industrialism while ignoring feminist critiques of patriarchy. While the state has heavily relied on the monopolization of agriculture to fund the social programs of the revolution, the state, having had raised and guaranteed wages, found itself under increasing strain in 1968 when the world market price for Sugar, Cuba’s primary export, fell to less than 2 cents per pound (Báez, 2004). The crisis resulting from the reliance on a single export crop for national funding made it hard to situate blame outside the country. As rations tightened and Cubans became disgruntled, foot-dragging and absenteeism increased in the sugar mills and factories. Cubans began more regularly engaging in the black market, usually to satisfy food needs, which also hurt the governments’ ability to accumulate capital. In an effort to¶ collect this money, dollar stores were made available (discussed below). What have these changes looked like in practice?

**Lifting the embargo destroys the Cuban revolution, which is key to worldwide anti-neoliberal revolution.**

**Wenston & Woods ‘08**

(Fred & Alan, Alan Woods is a Trotskyist political theorist and author. He is one of the leading members of the International Marxist Tendency, as well as its British affiliate group Socialist Appeal, Vultures hovering over Cuba after Fidel Castro steps down http://www.cjournal.info/2008/02/20/vultures-hovering-over-cuba-after-fidel-castro-steps-down/)

**If the Cuban revolution were defeated**, as happened in Russia, **it would have a demoralizing effect first of all on the workers, youth and peasants of the whole of South America, and even on a world scale. On the other hand the regeneration of the Cuban revolution and the victory of the Venezuelan revolution would completely transform the situation on a world scale.**

Now there are important capitalist elements in Cuba. There is an increasing number of small traders, the people who hold dollars, black marketeers, who are increasingly interwoven with the party and the state. And that is the real threat to the Cuban revolution. A while back the leadership took measures to restrict the growth of the dollar economy. That will no doubt have an effect for a time, but in the long run it cannot stem the tide in the direction of a market economy.

One of the main reasons for this is the increased participation of Cuba on world markets, which they are compelled to do now with the collapse of the Soviet Union. They have no alternative. We are not against that. In and of itself it would be a progressive development. The Bolsheviks attempted to trade with the capitalists on the world market. Lenin and Trotsky actually offered American capitalists the possibility for them to conduct business in places like Siberia: to open up whole parts of Russia and lease it to them as concessions – rather it lease it to them to be correct, not give it to them. And that was absolutely correct, as long as the Bolsheviks maintained the firm control of the state. But the Bolshevik Revolution and the Soviet state in its infancy was a direct threat, and therefore the American, British and French bourgeois would not trade with them. They wanted to crush the Bolshevik revolution because it was a threat.

**The Cuban revolution represents a threat to capitalism and imperialism because it gives an example. Therefore the American imperialists at this stage they do not want to trade with Cuba, they want to throttle Cuba; they want to destroy Cuba.**

**If the truth were to be told, the American ruling class are a little bit lacking in mental equipment. If they were a bit more intelligent they would not blockade Cuba. On the contrary, they would promote trade with Cuba**. That would materially assist the bourgeois counter-revolutionary forces inside Cuba. But because they are all a little bit thick – and the big boss in the White House is exceptionally thick – **they do the opposite of what is required, from their class point of view.**

#### Expanding globalization to Cuba is part of an imperial strategy to displace revolutionary potential in Cuba. The outcome of the expansion of globalization is environmental destruction and inequality.

Bliss 2005 (Dr. Susan Bliss: Director of Global Education, 7/5/2005, “Sustainability of Modern Cuba’s post revolution globalisation process”,)

Globalisation is not a new phenomenon in Cuba, evolving from the 16th century with the first expansion of European capitalism and accelerating from 1870-1914 with increased transport of goods. But while the world became more globalized driven by falling trade barriers (1950-1980) and deregulation of financial institutions (1980s) Cuba experienced restricted globalisation because of US imposed sanctions (1960s- 2005). Since the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989, ushering in perestroika and glasnost, globalisation has threatened to engulf Cuba that has responded by developing a unique blend of both globalisation and localisation (glocalisation) emphasising heterogeneous development and cultural exclusiveness transforming the economy and society from late 19th century. Many Cubans still fervently adhere to strict egalitarian values of the revolution (Stokes, 2003) arguing that western, materialistic globalisation ignores its dysfunctional aspects, such as environmental degradation, loss of community, social inequality and needs to look at possible multiple, eclectic approaches to societal development (Toffler, 1990) for the development of a more sustainable, equitable future. For Castro, the global economy is an uneven playing field holding many dangers for small, developing countries, like Cuba, as it works towards a difficult blend of global market and restricted state and civil society economic management. For Cubans globalisation has a substantive meaning (transcontinental circuits of capital, trade and production) but an ideological use (neo-liberalism) that grew with the demise of the socialist bloc in early 1990s and had profound effects on the legitimacy of Cuban socialism, as an alternative to capitalism. Most Cuban socialists support anti-globalisation as they envisage the US as the main driving force advocating financial imperatives and the rule of the strong. In contrast Cubans believe it should be replaced with a socialist system that promotes equality and shared values of humanity and markets that are ‘free and fair’, equitably structured and immune from corporate power.

## Security

#### Multilat is a tool of empire building and encourage resentment, turning case.

**Petras and Veltmeyer, 7** - \*Professor Emeritus in Sociology at Binghamton University in New York and Adjunct Professor in International Development Studies at Saint Mary’s University; \*\*Professor of Development Studies at the Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas in Mexico and Professor of Sociology and International Development Studies at St. Mary’s University, (James and Henry, Multinationals on Trial: Foreign Investment Matters, 10/2007, eBook)

Empire builders operate through a variety of unequal ‘treaties’ and agreements. These include: 1. Bilateral relations between the empire and client state; 2. Multilateral agreements – relations between the empire and regions (Central American Free Trade Area, LAFTA – Latin American Free Trade Area) 3. Sub-regional pacts – relations between the empire and specific clients. These agreements are based on the scope and degree of subordination of the particular ruling elite(s) in each geographical unit. The ‘easiest’ and least complicated mode of empire building is to move step-by-step – the salami tactics – of incorporating countries with compliant rulers via bilateral agreements. This does not preclude imperial policymakers from looking toward incorporating broader geopolitical units into the empire. The playing off of one region over another in terms of marginal trade and loan concessions and regimes changes in neighbouring countries can set the stage for the incorporation of sub-regions into the empire. Eventually, the empire builders may ‘go for’ entire regions, via continent-wide agreements. Two fundamental limitations to the strategy of empire building via geographical incorporation have emerged: 1) The internal opposition of the majority of the population adversely affected by imperial domination and 2) the non-reciprocal nature of the treaties adversely affecting the elites within the country to be incorporated in the empire. The latter contradiction is more acute in the everyday debates, negotiations and conferences between the empire and its clients. The US and European imperial states depend on the political support of non-competitive groups, especially in the powerful agricultural sector to sustain imperial expansion. There is also an important dialectic of conflict and complementarity between the ‘advanced’ sector of the capitalist system represented by the global multinational corporations, and the relatively backward, highly subsidized and government protected local capitalists. In order to secure the support of client states and the ruling elites in the Developing World for the incorporation of their countries into the empire (i.e. globalization), imperial policy makers in the US and Europe, and Japan, are forced to lower trade barriers and end protectionism and subsidies to the backward sectors and industries that are unable to compete against Third world producers. However, while Third World export elites are quite willing to shortchange workers, manufacturers, and public employees, they are not willing to commit economic suicide. The dilemma for the empire builders is that they need the political support of both their own country’s backward (in terms of the globalization imperative) economic sectors and the export-oriented elites in the Third World, in countries such as Brazil and India, whose economic interests are directly opposed to them. This conflict has resulted in the collapse of the Doha round of WTO free trade negotiations and it has killed the Bush regime’s proposal of a continental free trade zone in the Americas.

#### They don’t accesses a rejection of American Exceptionalism in their discourse because they expose Cuba to neoliberalism and is a guise for more Exceptionalism of American Policies

#### Despite the affirmative’s benevolent intentions, their framing of Cuban intervention justifies the expansion of American security throughout Latin America

Lima 2011 (Lázaro. "Empire's Remains: Cuba, Cuban America, and “the American 1898”.American Literary History vol. 23 no. 2)

Louis A. Perez, Jr.’s Cuba in the American Imagination: Metaphor and the Imperial Ethos also situates the political importance of the American 1898 as the signal template from which to understand US interventions abroad. For Perez, an “imperial ethos” allowed the US to “stake their claim to world leadership on the basis of moral superiority, the use of power not for territorial aggrandizement or commercial advantage, but for the service of humanity” (94). Over the course of six chapters, Perez situates the centrality of 1898 to our current understanding of Cuban–US relations. According to Perez, Cuba became a laboratory for US impe- rial prerogatives and the training ground for American interventions abroad: “So profoundly dense were the metaphorical representations with which the Americans subsequently claimed to exercise power over Cuba that it became all but impossible for them to imagine their purpose in terms other than those they had invented in the nineteenth century” (94). Perez’s project provides important narrative and visual linkages between the Monroe Doctrine’s nineteenth-century afterlives by demonstrating how it has informed US policy for nearly two centuries. Perez’s impressive collection of visual material—“read” along with editorials, novels, travel narratives, poems, speeches, monuments, and more—provides substantial evidence of how metaphors about Cuban–US relations from the American 1898 to the present created a hegemonic “visual vernacular” that enabled the US to dominate the island for national self-interests that were represented as a benefit to Cuba. For Perez, visual culture plays a significant role in not only dominating the island’s interests in the first half of the twentieth century, but also in allowing the US to define itself as a superpower insofar as those images helped to create the scaffolding from which US power was justified and deployed elsewhere in the world. Pe ́rez archive permits us, quite literally, to see how a visual vernacular emerged that helped create US national pedagogies capable of eliding the role of the empire, all the while instructing American citizens how to understand imperial domination as a selfless national imperative for the benefit of the colonized. In so doing, Perez demonstrates how hegemony was secured at home for the US imperial project on the island through an insistence on print culture’s ability to reach literate, semiliterate, and also presumably illiterate publics who were visually instructed as to how to understand Cuba from the vantage point of US imperial policy.

#### You should be skeptical of their engagement with Cuba – expanding American geopolitical influence in the region only serves to further the goals of US hegemony and the securitization of borders.

Nicol, 2011 [Heather Nicol, Associate Professor in the Department of Geography, Trent University, Peterborough, Ontario, Canada, “U.S. Hegemony in the 21st century: Cuba's Place in the regionalizing geopolitics of North America and Caribbean Countries” Journal of Borderlands Studies, 23:1, 31-52, DOI: 10.1080/08865655.2008.9695687]

The process of U.S. hegemony in North American economies is not unique or unrelated to the larger workings of international order and world economy. The changing tenor of Canadian, U.S., and Mexican geopolitical rhetoric, couched in free trade and securitization, is related to the bigger project of condoning and supporting U.S. hegemony in the Western Hemisphere. It is also closely related to the larger project of globalization in which the U.S. has been a driving force during the 20th and 21st centuries (Agnew 2005). Over the past decade, the U.S. has focused closely on defining regional parameters for U.S. hegemonic influence or extraterritorial control within North America, meaning that the shape of geo-economic and geopolitical regionalization in North America and its “neighbors” (the Caribbean and Central America for example) is directly related to U.S. responses to globalization issues. Indeed, there is a large literature suggesting that hegemony is central to U.S. imperialist claims to intervention at global, hemispheric, and continental levels (Slater 2004; Agnew 2003, 2005). While originally the desire for such hegemony was couched in Cold War terms regarding the right of the U.S. to intervene in Western Hemisphere affairs in general, and the need for its neighbors to support the benevolent superpower in its bid for hemispheric security as communism was “contained,” today such grand strategies are less obviously stated. Rather than the nakedly aggressive military and economic agendas that characterized Cold War or later “Reaganomics” rhetoric, U.S. hegemony is now promoted as a civilizing mission in support of democracy, human rights, and continental (as well as global) free trade. In this sense it is not unlike the EU mission in Eastern Europe and beyond, although the EU and U.S. differ in terms of the methods they employ. In both North America and the Caribbean, Cuba has figured prominently as a marker for changing bilateral and multilateral relations with the U.S., as well as for new geopolitical discourses concerning the changing role of the U.S. in New World and global orders. For example, there has been policy convergence in the sense that increasingly hegemonic and U.S.-based attitudes towards Cuba are currently being adopted by Canada, Mexico, and the Caribbean Community (CARICOM). Friendly relations have been disrupted if diplomatic ties are not. But there has also been policy divergence in others, as holding out against Helms-Burton and other U.S. prescriptions for regime change in Cuba have also become normative for America’s neighboring countries. The underlying coherence, or consistent rationale for this apparent contradiction is given by the fact that in all cases the resulting convergence and divergence in policies and diplomatic relations, or compliance and resistance to U.S. insistence of economic embargo and political shunning, are consciously framed to in reference to a U.S. geopolitical rhetoric. Cuba as a field of contest, or a contested arena for U.S. intervention, and therefore contested legitimacy of U.S. hegemonic claims. Thus the real theme is the contours of resistance or support to U.S. policy in North America and the success or failure in the universalization of U.S. Cuban policy (Agnew 2005; Slater 2004; Nicol 2002b) rather than actual events in Cuba. Even as the U.S. position on Cuba (made concrete in the Helms Burton Act) continues to reinforce the strong and impermeable physical and political border the U.S. shares with Cuba, this border is not a “hold-over” from the Cold War. It is a dynamic and ongoing construction, embargo, political, and societal “shunning” on several fronts—requiring policies which construct new kinds of “walls” with neighboring countries as well as with Cuba itself. In this sense, NAFTA is critical to this process, although as Agnew (2003) suggests, more generally, the criterion for this ideological borderline are structural and historical, going back to the very nature of the state system itself. This means that in even terms of its relationship to Cuba, the apparent continuity in Cuban-American relations since the turn of the 20st century to the Post Cold War period is actually quite deceptive. Significant shifts have taken place, particularly with respect to how Cuba policy has become a political marker for compliance with U.S. strategic and economic interests among North American states, and how Cuba has itself adapted to the neoliberalization of U.S. foreign policy in terms of its own regional relationship within the Caribbean. Both of these are significant outcomes. In the case of subordinating Cuba, however, the U.S. has tackled a complex problem in that conformity to geopolitical rhetoric is now required at a continental level. This complex relationship—U.S. hegemony and North American complicity or resistance— has served to define the edges or borders of American hegemony in North America during the 21st century. Bearing this in mind, if we look at foreign policies as important functional foundations for the construction of boundaries for a 21st century U.S. political space, then it is impossible to support the idea that economic integration can proceed without significant structural change in the foreign policies of North America countries at all levels of engagement. The situation in North America suggests that clear convergences have occurred in the area of foreign policy, and that these shifts are situated in geopolitical events that have postdated the imposition of the NAFTA. Indeed, Canada, Mexico, the U.S., Caribbean countries, and Cuba have been engaged in a complex and often reactive foreign policy-making process for a number of years. While U.S.-Cuba relations remain conspicuous in much Western Hemisphere discussion and foreign policy-making analysis, Canadians, Mexicans, and Caribbean nations outside of Cuba have understood the relationship to Cuba in very different ways than their American neighbors. This has meant that Canada-Cuba relations have become part of a broader discussion about Canada-U.S.-Cuba relations, or even Western Hemisphere relations towards Cuba and the Caribbean, which continue to challenge the hegemonic perspectives of U.S. foreign policy towards Cuba. The virulent rhetoric concerning Cuba which defines much of the U.S. political position is not about Cuba per se, but about the logics of the leadership role which the U.S. has defined for itself in the Western Hemisphere, since World War II, particularly in North America and the countries immediately touching its geographical borders.

**THE CATEGORY OF WOMAN IS A SPECIFIC EXAMPLE OF HOW CAPITALISM USES IDENTITY POLITICS TO FIGHT FOR LEGITIMACY**

**Hennessy, Professor of English, SUNY- Albany, 2000**

**(Rosemary, Profit and Pleasure: Sexual Identities in Late Capitalism,)**

For the historical materialist, however, the codes of cultural difference, or the cultural signifiers on which meaning, consciousness, and identity depend, are socially and historically produced. In other words, to gloss Marx’s famous words, “it is not consciousness [or signification] that determines life, but life that determines consciousness” (Collected Works, vol. 5, 37). The material requirements that allow human life to continue depend on social relations

that encompass more than language, consciousness, identity, discourse—although they do depend on them too. It is this “more” that constitutes the material “outside” of language—those human relations through which needs are met—but which is only made meaningful through language.

The differences out of which cultural meanings are made are sites of struggle and contest because of their material connection to the inequitable relations of exploitation on which capitalist production depends. As I indicated earlier, however, this relationship is not a direct or a simply determined one. Antonio Gramsci’s understanding of the relationship between ruling ideas or ideology and the ruling class is useful for conceptualizing the complexity of this connection. 9 Ruling ideas are not guaranteed dominance under capitalism because they are already coupled to the ruling class (Hall, “Guarantees,” 44). Rather, it is the coupling of dominant ideas to a historical bloc that has acquired power over the means of production that ideological struggle is intended to secure. Class relations set the terrain for these struggles. As they are fought out, historical connections are established that map the ideological landscape of a particular social formation. These historical connections span bureaucratic and legal “official stories,” the theories and empirical proofs of science, the traces and stratified deposits of popular philosophy Gramsci refers to as “common sense” (1971, 324). Ultimately, ideological struggle over all modes of sense-making is a struggle for mastery and control over the forces of production and the state. The process by which this control is secured by a historical bloc is called hegemony. For Gramsci, hegemony comprises an array of practices that constitute a sense of reality for most people; it is a “realized complex of experiences, relationships, activities”— a culture that “also has to be seen as the lived dominance and subordination of particular classes” (Williams 1997, 110).

Certain differences come to matter in the historical connections within a culture’s prevailing knowledges because they are pertinent to the struggle for hegemony. Gender and race are two especially pertinent ways that difference has been made meaningful in the history of capitalism, and often they are coincident—that is, gender is racialized and race is gendered. What it means to be a woman or a man, how we name male and female—and even the distinction between them—are sites of struggle because these namings can and have been used to justify, legitimize, authorize, and explain away the contradictions on which capitalism’s relations of production rely. To give a simple example: the differences among the signs “Ms.,” “Miss,” and “Mrs.” as a way to name women are not simply differences among signifiers only, although they are that too. The emergence of “Ms.” into the cultural system was a historical event brought about by political struggles over the hegemonic ideology of womanhood. The distinguishing feature of “Ms.” is that it unhinges the definition of “woman” from a relationship to men—either unmarried or married—in opposition to the patriarchal notion of “woman,” which always signified her relation to a man and which was used to legitimize women’s place in the division of labor, both in the workplace and in the home. The struggles over what it means to be a woman pressured the contradictions in the hegemonic notion of woman as free agent and exploited worker, citizen and property of father or husband. As these struggles were articulated, “Ms.” was read as interrupting the patriarchal gender system. When it first circulated in the United States, “Ms.” was synonymous with “feminist,” and at the same time it was a signifier that for some merely updated the hegemonic racial ideology of woman. “Ms.” was racialized as white because the campaign for this renaming of woman was orchestrated initially by the National Organization for Women, which had not made women of color or the problem of racism a priority, a political choice that had been a consistent characteristic of mainstream U.S. feminism since the nineteenth century. As a result, some black women were reluctant to embrace the signifier “Ms.”

#### Reject the Affirmative for their use of apocalyptic rhetoric—It only creates the self-fulfilling prophecies and securitization they claim to solve

Coviello 2000 (Peter, English at Bowdoin, Queer Frontiers, Apocalypse from Now on, googlebooks)

Apocalypse, as I began by saying, changed--it did not go away. And here I want to hazard my second assertion: if, in the nuclear age of yesteryear, apocalypse signified an event threatening everyone and everything with (in Jacque Derrida's suitably menacing phrase) "remainderless and a-symbolic destruction," then in the postnuclear world apocalypse is an affair whose parameters are definitively local. In shape and in substance, apocalypse is defined now by the affliction it brings somewhere else, always to an "other" people whose very presence might be written as a kind of dangerous contagion, threatening the safety and prosperity of a cherished "general population." This fact seems to me to stand behind Susan Sontag's incisive observation, from 1989, that "Apocalypse is now a long running serial: not Apocalypse now but apocalypse from now on. The decisive point here in the perpetuation of the threat of apocalypse (the point Sontag goes on at length to miss) is that the apocalypse is ever present because, as an element in a vase economy of power, it is ever useful. That is, through the perpetual threat of destruction--through the constant reproduction of the figure of the apocalypse--the agencies of power ensure their authority to act on and through the bodies of a particular population. No one turns this point more persuasively than Michel Foucault, who in the final chapter of his first volume of the History of Sexuality addresses himself to the problem of a power that is less repressive than productive, less life-threatening than, in his words, life-administering. Power, he contends, "exerts a positive influence on life...and endeavors to administer, optimize, and multiply it, subjecting it to precise controls and comprehensive regulations." In his brief comments on what he calls the "atomic situation", however, Foucault insists as well that the productiveness of modern power must not be mistaken for a uniform repudiation of violent or even lethal means. For as "managers of life and survival, of bodies and the race," agencies of modern power presume to act "on the behalf of the existence of everyone." Whatsoever might be construed as a threat to life and survival in this way serves to authorize any expression of force, no matter how invasive, or indeed, potentially annihilating. "If genocide is indeed the dream of modern power," Foucault writes, "this is not because of a recent return to the ancient right to kill, it is because power is situated and exercised at the level of life, the species, the race, and the large-scale phenomena of population." For a state that would arm itself not with the power to kill its population, but with a more comprehensive power over the patterns and functioning of its collective life, the threat of an apocalyptic demise, nuclear or otherwise, seems a civic initiative that can scarcely be done without.